

BD 555

.W2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

BD 555

Chap. .... Copyright No. ....

Shelf . W 2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.















ELDER AARON WALKER

# PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY:

OR,

THE VITAL AND PHYSICAL  
FORCE PHILOSOPHIES OF CREATION  
AND THOUGHT

DISCUSSED, COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

BY

*Elder* AARON WALKER

INDIANAPOLIS  
THE HOLLENBECK PRESS

1900

Library of Congress  
Two COPIES RECEIVED  
JAN 24 1901  
Copyright entry  
Sep. 4, 1900  
No. a 21927  
SECOND COPY

B1555  
W2

COPYRIGHT 1900  
BY  
AARON WALKER





Ms. Aug 26, 1911

## AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PREFACE.

The author of this little book is a son of Elder John Walker, whose remains are in the Odd Fellows cemetery at Plainfield, Hendricks county, Indiana. The author's birthday was the seventeenth day of October, 1826. His native state was North Carolina. He was brought to Indiana in very early life, and educated in the schools of the early history of Indiana ; taught school under the school laws of those times. Was ordained to the ministry on the fifth Lord's-day in May, 1853, after a public life of one year, in the congregation of Center church, Rush county, Indiana, and by its elders. The following is a true copy of his certificate of ordination :

"This is to certify, to all whom it may concern, that Aaron Walker, a member of the church at Center, in Rush county, was ordained to the ministry of the gospel of Christ by fasting, laying on of the hands, and prayer, on the fifth Lord's-day in May, 1853, and is hereby authorized to preach the word, administer the ordinances of the Lord's house, and solemnize matrimony.

"Given under our hands June first, 1853.

"ISAAC S. LOWE,

"GABRIEL F. SUTTON,

"ILA REEVES,

*"Elders."*

The extent of his traveling in the ministry has been very great. He has administered the sacrament of baptism in 157 different localities. Has been in public discussions 180 days—four, five and six hours per day. Has discussed the merits of the materialistic philosophy from every conceivable standpoint with men who professed to be Christians, and with unbelievers, and now presents this volume of lectures, first delivered in a medical college to counteract the natural tendency of the study of the physical sciences to plunge medical students into the atheistic philosophy of materialism, and also at the request of the medical men who heard them delivered. And if this volume shall redound to the advancement of the human mind in the knowledge of scientific and philosophical truths, the author will feel that his labor has not been in vain.

AARON WALKER.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Creation With or Without Intelligence, Which?.....	1
Design in Nature .....	13
A Living Intelligence or Dead Atoms, Which?.....	26
The Origin of a Christian Idea.....	42
Freedom, the Basis of Equal Rights and Religious Belief..	51
Artificial or Natural Justice, Which?.....	65
All Men Live by Faith.....	72
Natural Morality, Civilization and Religious Belief.....	83
Genesis and Geology.....	94
Sources of Our Knowledge.....	100
Conception and Judgment.....	111
Hypotheses or Facts, Which?.....	124
Intuition and Inner Mind.....	137
Mind or Soul, Its Faculties and Value.....	152
Mind, Soul, Spirit, Intellect and Emotions.....	164
Monotheism and Civilization.....	172
Inspiration.....	188



## CREATION WITH OR WITHOUT INTELLIGENCE, WHICH?

Unbelievers in creation by intelligence have worked, in the fields of astronomy, and geology, and psychology, to establish the physical force theory of creation, and thought—a creation without God, claiming that the planets, and satellites, and stars, and comets, originated from fragments thrown off from the sun's fiery mass, which was always a mere hypothesis, an imagination entirely destitute of proof, for it is certain that no man could tell the nature of a mass of matter thousands or millions of miles distant, nor tell whether it was cold and growing colder, or hot and growing hotter. It was never claimed that any man ever saw the fragments in their cooling process scaling off into rings, and breaking up into planets, no astronomer ever witnessed anything of this kind; it was one of the air-castles of hypothetical reasoners, a mere speculation, always unsatisfactory even with those who endorsed it. It made them no wiser touching the origin of worlds.

They were always troubled with these questions: Where did the gaseous matter of the sun



come from? How did it get so hot when the space around it was cold enough to overcome the heat at the surface? And when did the surface begin to cool? Did it contain in itself the principles of chemical affinity, animal and vegetable life, and intellect? If so how did they get there? If not so, where did they come from? The theory never did, nor ever will, answer these questions. If the fiery mass had power to move itself it was equal to a favorite illustration among atheists, viz.: a rotating grindstone, throwing off, or scattering water, but the theory requires the grindstone to turn itself; it supposes the power to put the fire-cloud in motion was raised by its cooling faster at one place than at another, but why should such a thing occur? No reason has ever been assigned. And if it was eternally hot why should it not remain eternally hot?

According to this hypothesis the outer cooling ring, cooling faster, contracting and becoming more dense, should have fallen into the center of the mass, otherwise there was no law of gravitation connected with the thing. But this is not all of the objections. The theory allows that the fire mist kept cooling and shrinking up while the rings of the very same heat and material kept cooling faster, contracting and widening out at the same time; a piece of behavior unknown among fluids and solids throughout the world; a thing contrary to all human observation and rea-



son. The only rings which astronomers have examined have been closing in on their planet, Saturn, and it is believed by astronomers, and was predicted by Sir David Brewster, that they will finally unite with the body of the planet.

It is an essential condition of the hypothesis, that the cooling, contracting rings were of a different density from the rest of the mass. Their flying off from the more fluid portion, called their divergence, was supposed to arise from their growing heavier as they cooled, and therefore more powerfully disposed to fly off, and rotating so much faster than the heated internal mass, from which they derived their motion, they finally flew out from it. This performance reminds us of the Yankee's mill-wheel, which traveled three times faster than the stream that moved it, while the current of water was so swift that it caused saw-logs to fly up out of the water.

Astronomical facts and mechanical principles always conflicted with this theory of creation; according to it the planets furthest from the sun should be the most dense, or compact, but the very opposite is conceded to be true. The planet that is nearest the sun is six or eight times more dense than some that are further off, viz.: Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune.

“The orbits of the comets, being inclined at all angles of the sun's equator, are often out of the plane of his rotation, and therefore in the

way of the theory.” “Then the moons of Uranus, revolving in a contrary direction to all the other planets, fly right into the face of the theory.” The sun, being the only luminous body in our system of planets, all being, according to the theory, made of the same material, and by the same process, is, in itself, a self-evident refutation of this theory, and of any other theory of creation by blind mechanical forces.

The same power, whether natural or supernatural, that set the sun in the center of primary planets, placed Saturn in the center of the orb of his moons, or secondary planets, and Jupiter in the center of his four, and our earth in the center of the moon's orbit. If the creative cause had been a blind one, without design or contrivance, the sun might have been a body like all the other planets, a body without light and heat. Why was it that there was but one body in our system qualified to give light and heat to all the rest? The immortal Newton says, “I know no reason for this, but that the author thought it convenient.”—*Optics* 4, p. 438.

The nebular hypothesis was, at one time, quite popular among the enemies of the Christian religion, was regarded by them as their stronghold; conceived by them to be a demonstration of creation without God, a simplification and explanation of creation by mere physical and mechanical forces. But large telescopes have annihilated

the theory, and demonstrated the proposition that worlds exist by their own nature, and of necessity, wherever there is room for them, to be both false and absurd. Still the ignorant talk about the nebular theory, about star-dust, and fire-cloud world making?

Large telescopes have demonstrated the fact that what was called nebulous matter, clouds of star-dust, was stars away in the distance; “and also that there is unoccupied space, enough for millions of worlds as large as ours, and therefore, the fact that worlds do not exist by their own nature, and of necessity, wherever there is room for them. In these facts of observation by means of improved telescopes the nebular theory of creation is broken down and lost.” The orderly existence of planets just where they are implies will, design and intelligence.

The laws of motion require that a body projected must continue in a straight line or direction from the projecting force, unless something, outside of itself, comes in contact with it, changing its course. This law is violated in the movements of all the planets and heavenly bodies. Here mechanical law is routed, and physical force excluded.

The orderly, continuous and circuitous movement of the planets is against the physical force theory. To affirm that matter moves itself after the manner of planetary movements is an insult

to common sense, and contrary to observation as connected with the movements of all earthly things. When the law of projectiles makes and projects a cannon ball, and continues its movement in space in an elliptical orbit, then we may believe that the law of mechanics and the physical forces made the worlds and moves them.

The continuous movement of all the heavenly bodies requires, of necessity, an ever-present omnipotence. Law is not creator; it is a rule of action, requiring an intelligence behind it to see that it is executed or enforced. The laws of nature are the art of God. The physical forces, so-called, are not powers rising out of inertia, having the guardianship of all things. Above, below, and all around is omnipotence—God himself, speaking to us in a language which the Christian heart may understand. “The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal power and divinity.” The explosive theory of creation originated with Buffon; he agreed with La Place that all our worlds were in the same fire-cloud of nebulous matter—the sun. He introduces for our consideration a comet striking the sun obliquely, projecting to a distance a torrent of the matter of which it was composed, just as a stone thrown obliquely into a basin of water causes it



to splash out. The torrent of matter in a fused state broke up into parts enough to make all the primary planets and moons, stars and comets of our universe. These parts and fragments were arrested at different distances from the sun, according to their density, or the impetus they received, and by rotary motion, forever violating the laws of motion, they became globes. Of course they were arrested at different distances from the sun without being stopped in their movement, and condensing by cold they became opaque, solid planets, moons and stars. This accidental chance formation of worlds gives no reason for the form of their orbits, nor what it was that arrested them in the distance without stopping them, nor for their rotary motion on their axis in one direction, with the exception of the moons of Uranus. And it leaves us curious to know where the splashing material came from, and how it was melted down into a fluid state ready to be splashed. We are also anxious to know where the comet came from, and what drove it so correctly through space as to hit the sun so obliquely. To-day there are unbelievers in the Christian religion who advocate this foolish theory. Buffon's theory received a little lift with its advocates when the discovery of five small planets was made.

There is a certain proportion observed in the distances of the orbits of the planets from each

other, a width of the gauge, as it were, on the celestial railway. This was the width of a track between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter. On this track no train was seen moving until the five little planets were discovered upon it. This excited the curiosity of astronomers, and they supposed that some greater planet had exploded. Three of these small planets were discovered in the first seven years of this century. And Dr. Obler, the discoverer of Pallas, one of the five, finding that they were nearly in the same track, but sometimes crossing each the other's path, and that they were very small, bearing about the proportion to a regular planet that a hand-car does to a freight locomotive, imagined that they were formed by the explosion of a larger planet, that the boiler of the locomotive had bursted, and the fragments had lit on the track, in the shape of hand-cars, and resolved to keep running and do the business of the line.

But thinking men wanted to know why the exploded locomotive was not seen on the track before the explosion. And how it was that an explosion should create such beautiful orderly planets running regularly and wisely all by chance or accident. No mansion was ever blown into handsome cottages, nor ship at sea blown into life-boats, nor exploding engines blown into model engines, but the theory retired the All-wise Creator, and became somewhat popular among



the enemies of the Bible. But astronomers soon discovered that every small planet and every little star had a track of its own ; and every new discovery augmented the difficulties in the way of Buffon's theory, until it is no longer a question in astronomy.

It is now a settled fact that the most unsubstantial clouds that float in the highest regions of the air, if they were actually fire-clouds, would be dense and massive bodies in comparison with the texture of a comet.—*Herschel's Outlines of 1853*, p. 558. The science of astronomy confounds all the speculations of men put up in the face of God, against his right to possess and govern his own homestead. The order and regularity of planetary movements speak as much for intelligence behind them as any old stone ax or chipped flint? Yes! A thousand times more. La Place found upon calculation the chances, by the formula of probabilities, were two millions to one against the regularities happening by accident, or chance, and four millions to one in favor of a common origin. The rotation of the sun being the central point, he thought, if he could account for this he could explain all the rest. He went to work and got up his theory, of which we have already spoken. It is now known that the sun is not a fire-cloud, but a dark body surrounded with a belt of light, just as the Hebrew expresses it in

the first chapter of Genesis, "Two great light bearers."

The theory called the nebular theory originated in astronomical ignorance of stars away in the distance, which seemed to be so close together, owing to their great distance from us, that they were regarded as nebulous matter, or star dust. Herschel's large telescope resolved the "milky way" into a bed of stars away off in the vast deep of the great expanse, and when Lord Ross's great telescope was turned to the heavens the nebula all proved to be stars projected against a dark sky.—*North British Review*, No. 3, p. 477. So the La Place theory of creation is, by observation, forever destroyed. Then let us introduce something better upon which axioms can stand and which has always been abreast of scientific discoveries in its scientific allusions, which are flashes of light away in the darkness of the past, undiscovered for centuries. It is the testimony of that old book, called the Bible. It says: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This points to the shores of an eternity in the past. And it is worthy of notice that it is not formation, but creation; formation was subsequent to creation. This beginning lies beyond the grasp of the human intellect, beyond all calculations. It is the statement of a fact. Scientific discoveries will never be able to place any certain number of years where it does not

exist in thought expressed, neither in science, nor in the Bible. No record in the rocks, or in the Bible, or chronology in or out of the Bible, will carry us back to the beginning. The first verse of the first chapter of Genesis states a fact in such a manner as to place it beyond calculation and scientific refutation.

The Bible, in its scientific allusions, was always ahead of scientific discoveries. Three thousand years before the trade-winds were understood, before Maury discovered the rotation and revolutions of the wind currents, it was written, "The wind goeth towards the south, and turneth about to the north. And the wind returneth again according to his circuits."—*Eccl.*, 1:6. Thousands of years before Copernicus, or Newton, or Galileo were born, Isaiah said of the Infinite One, "It is He that sitteth upon the *circle* of the earth."—*Isaiah*, 40:22. And John wrote of creatures in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, recognizing the fact that both sides of the earth were inhabited.—*Rev.*, 5:13. Wisdom is personified in *Prov.*, 8:24 to 26, in these words, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was. When there were no depths I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water; before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth, while as yet He had not made the earth, nor the highest part

of the dust of the world.” In the geological record mountains rise and settle, and in this century it has been discovered that the oldest formation of the rocky stratas lies upon the highest mountain top. In the ninetieth psalm the man of God glances at the primeval mountains, monuments of God’s work, and sings, “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the universe, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.” This word “beginning” is one of the most appropriate titles of the Infinite Creator, for the reason that he is the great first cause or ultimate in the analysis of creation. In the Bible it is said, “I am the BEGINNING and the ENDING, saith the Lord, who is, and was, and is to come—THE ALMIGHTY.”



## DESIGN IN NATURE.

Webster defines the term “design” thus : 1. A plan or representation of a thing by an outline ; sketch ; general view ; first idea represented by visible lines, as in painting or architecture. 2. A scheme or plan in the mind. A wise man is distinguished by the judiciousness of his designs. 3. Purpose ; intention ; aim ; implying a scheme or plan in the mind. “This active mind infused through all the space unites and mingles with the mighty mass.”—*Dryden*.

Voltaire said : “Benedict Spinoza is compelled to acknowledge an intelligence presiding over all. Had he denied this I should have said to him : Benedict, you are a fool ; you possess intelligence, and you deny it? It will be observed and insisted upon by some, that if a statue or a watch were shown to a savage who had never seen them, he would certainly acknowledge that they were the products of some intelligent agent, more powerful and ingenious than himself, and we are equally bound to acknowledge that the universe, and the phenomena of nature are the productions of an agent whose intelligence and powers are far superior to our own.” He further said : “If a clock is not made to tell the time of the day, I will ad-

mit that final causes are nothing but chimeras, and be content to go by the name of a fool to the end of my life. All the parts of our great world seem made for each other.”

Epicurus and Lucretius tell us the eye is not made to see, but that since it was found out that eyes were capable of being used for that purpose they have been applied to that purpose. According to them the mouth is not formed to speak, and eat, nor the stomach to digest, nor the heart to receive the blood from the veins and impel it through the arteries, nor the feet to walk, nor the ears to hear, yet at the same time these very shrewd and consistent persons admitted that tailors made garments to clothe them, and that masons built houses to lodge them, and thus ventured to deny to nature what they conceded to the most insignificant artists employed by themselves. M. le Prieur, in the *Spectacle of Nature*, says the tides were attached to the ocean to enable the vessels to enter more easily into their ports, and to preserve the water from corruption; he might just as well have urged that legs were made to wear boots, and noses to bear spectacles.

In order to satisfy ourselves of the truth of a final cause, in any particular instance, it is necessary that the effect produced should be universal and invariable in time and place. Ships have not existed in all times, nor upon all seas; so it



can not be said that the ocean was made for ships. It is impossible not to perceive how ridiculous it would be to maintain that nature had toiled on from the very earliest period of time to adjust herself to the inventions of our fortuitous and arbitrary arts, all of which are of so late a date in our discoveries, but it is perfectly clear that if noses were not made for spectacles, they were made for smelling, and there have been noses ever since there were men. In the same manner hands, instead of being bestowed for the sake of gloves, are certainly destined for all those uses to which the metacarpus, the phalanx of the fingers and the movements of the wrist render them applicable. Cicero, who doubted every thing else, had no doubt about final causes. It appears particularly difficult to suppose that those parts of the human frame, by which the perpetuation of the species is conducted, should not, in fact, have been intended and destined for that purpose. It is, as it appears to me, willfully to shut the eyes and the understanding to assert that there is no design in nature ; and if there is design there is an intelligent cause—a God.”

The chain of mountains thrown around our great continent as water breaks, protecting our agricultural interests, and the rivers and streams fertilizing the fields to supply us with refreshments and give growth and beauty to vegetable

and animal life, appear no more to result from a concourse of dead atoms than the retina which receives the rays of light, or the crystalline humor which refracts it, or the drum of the ear which admits sounds, or the circulation of the blood in our veins, the systole and diastole of the heart, the regulating principle of life. It looks as though a man was destitute of intelligence who would deny that stomachs are made for digestion, and that eyes are made to see, and ears are made to hear, and that legs are made to walk.

When effects are invariably the same at all times and in all places, and are not the creatures of the beings to which they attach, then there is visibly a final cause. Animals have eyes and see, have ears and hear, have mouths with which they eat, a stomach, or something similar, by which they digest their food, and suitable means for expelling the refuse, have organs for the continuation of their species; and these natural gifts accomplish their regular work without any appliances or intermixtures of art. Here there must be clearly established a final cause; to deny a truth so well known throughout nature seems like a perversion of the faculties of common sense. These things are uniform, and are the immediate work of their author.

Who fixed the laws by which the moon contributes three-fourths of the flux and reflux of the ocean, and the sun the remaining fourth? Who

gave a rotary motion to the sun, in consequence of which it communicates its rays of light in the short time of seven minutes and a half to the eyes of man?

Chance is a word void of sense ; nothing can exist without a cause. The world is arranged according to mathematical laws, therefore it is arranged by an intelligence infinitely superior to man. Does such a being necessarily exist? It must be so ; for he must either have received his being from another, or be self-existent through his own nature. If through another, then we must look up to this other, which would in that case be the first cause ; so, on whichever side I turn I must admit a first cause, powerful and intelligent, who, by his own nature, is necessarily the first cause. Kepler rendered his name illustrious in the annals of science by developing the laws which regulate the motions of the planets. Assisted by the Danish philosopher, Tycho Brahe, he made these discoveries :

I. That the six primary planets known in his times moved around the sun in ellipses, having the sun in one of the foci, or central points.

II. That the planets describe round the sun equal areas in equal times.

III. That the squares of the periodical times in which the planets revolve around the sun are as the cubes of their mean distance from the sun. This discovery is found to be of great use in



astronomical calculations, for if the periodical times of two planets be given, and the distance of one of them from the center, the other may be found by the rule of proportion. A universe of such order must have a supreme intelligence presiding over it. It could not possibly be a world of chance, nor of mere physical forces, because its movements are a continual violation of the known laws of motion, as they are seen in connection with physical forces. The planets move as they ever have, while it is a law that a body projected will as certainly come to a state of rest, unless an infinite power with purpose, will and intention be with it to keep it moving. Again, it is a law of motion that a body will continue in a straight line from the projecting force, unless it comes in contact with something outside of itself changing its course. This law is violated in the movement of every planet known in the heavens ; they all move in their ellipses, have their “circles.”—*Isaiah, 40:22.*

By the middle of the sixteenth century the word “science” made its appearance, denoting connected and demonstrated knowledge, in opposition to art, which signified digested rules of operation, not connected with each other by deduction from common first principles.—*Zell's Encyclopedia.* So first principles, or first truths or axioms, are the ultimates or final causes in every science.

The natural sciences deal with cause and effect. An effect that always results from the same cause we call a natural law. Our knowledge of uniform effects is our knowledge of natural laws, and these are the first principles or foundation of the natural sciences—the ultimates of the sciences. And the ultimate of these laws is an intelligent agent, whose rules of action in nature are these very laws of nature. The laws of nature are the art of God.

Law, in and of itself, is nothing ; does nothing. The very word requires an agent behind it to enforce it.

Nature is full of contrivances.

Who contrived?

Nature is full of adaptations.

Who adapted?

Nature is full of correllations.

Who correllated?

Nature is full of the conservation of forces.

Who conserves?

The contriver designs.

The one who correllates, designs ; the one who conserves the forces, designs.

Wherever intelligence discovers contrivance, or correllations, or adaptations, or conservation of forces, there consciousness, which is the accredited basis of all evidence, testifies to an omnipotent intelligence as the only sufficient agent. To deny this is to destroy the foundation of all

justice, as it is administered in all the civil courts in christendom, throughout the civilized world. If the sun had been made to afford greater light the eye would have been useless, or made differently. If the heat which we attribute to the sun had been greatly augmented our bodies could not have endured it. If domestic animals had been endowed with reason they would not have served us at all. All created things are graduated upon a divine scale.

It is a fact that even the evidences of the Christian religion are adjusted upon a certain wise and benevolent scale, amounting to a maximum beyond which they do not extend. Had they gone further all excellency in faith would have been destroyed. Had they fallen short every mouth could not have been stopped. While a small portion of the evidences is sufficient for some, it is all necessary for others. Those who do not believe upon the whole of it, and have one objection remaining when the whole is examined, that which would remove this one objection would destroy every virtue and excellency of faith, there would be nothing moral about it; it would be as unavoidable as the motions of a mill-wheel under a powerful head of water, or as the waving of tree tops beneath a whirlwind." Such would have placed morality and spirituality upon the plane of emotional insanity, upon the plane of mechanical necessity. Compulsory faith is neither

praiseworthy nor blameworthy, it is neither vice nor virtue. Paul said: "If I do that I would not it is no more I that do it."

Man with nought in charge could betray no trust,  
And if he fell would fall because he must.  
If love reward him or vengeance strike,  
His recompense in both would be unjust alike.

The man who wants compulsory faith, over which the will has no control, requires that kind of evidence which is incompatible with all moral virtue and goodness, for he would make belief like the fall of a volcanic stone.

The substitution of blind physical forces for the Creator of the heavens and of the earth, and spontaneous generation of life from dead atoms and natural selection, for the banishment of design from nature, will never meet the demands of common intelligence. The contrasts along the assumed line of the evolution of higher species from the lower, in the comparative anatomy of bodies, is a refutation of the hypothesis. The magnitude of this contrast is so great that all minds, both those on the one side and on the other, are compelled to acknowledge that the "missing link" is wanting, and this is a complete breakdown in the evolutionary speculation. The contrast between the intellectual powers of man and the instinctive powers of beasts, made for man's use, shows design in creation.

Man carries with him the characteristics of



sovereignty, necessary to his lordship over the lower kingdoms of nature. His body is so constituted as to enable him to execute the purposes of his mind, and bring everything within his reach which can minister to his wants and pleasures. Is man's dignity to be confounded with that of quadrupeds? The very idea is one of the strangest productions of the human imagination. It seems to indicate that the accumulated facts of our age have gone altogether beyond its capacity for generalization; and if it was not for the vigor seen everywhere it might be taken as an evidence that the human mind has fallen into a state of senility, and in its dotage mistaken for science the imaginations which were the dreams of its youth. The greatest fallacy is the assumption of natural selection as a cause; in nature it is not a cause at all. Its advocates call it the survival of the fittest, and allowing this to be true it is only a set of conditions, a method of intelligent will. But we have no proof that even this is a method by which intelligent will causes a transmutation of species. We have many proofs opposed to the hypothesis.

Neither can direct physical influences proceeding from the environment be viewed in the light of efficient causes of biological phenomena; for they, too, are only a set of conditions; we may denominate them conditioning influences, but even this implies a conditioning cause. The effi-



cient force producing modifications having reference to physical surroundings, is not only a force acting within, it is a force acting intelligently, and beneficently; and if it be demanded how we dare attribute intelligence and beneficence to a force so hopelessly inscrutable, we demand of the objector how he dare dishonor the deepest intuitions of his own soul, and brave all the consequences of so doing.—*Winchel's Evolution*, pp. 96, 97.

Design in nature is recognized by those who deny it; their endeavor to personify the “forces of nature” is continually breaking down their denial. The universality of the idea of purpose in nature is indicated by the universal tendency of such men to personify the forces by which it is claimed all natural phenomena are produced. It is a great injustice to scientific men to suspect them of unwillingness to accept the idea of a Creator because they try to keep the language of the sciences separate from the language of theology, and it is interesting to observe their failure.

It is impossible in describing physical phenomena to avoid the phraseology which identifies them with the phenomena of mind, and is molded on our conscious personality. Take the word “contrivance” for an example. How could science do without it? How could the subject of animal mechanics be scientifically dealt with without continual reference to *law*, as that by

which and through which special organs are formed for doing special work. It is impossible to describe or explain the facts we meet with in any science without investing the laws of nature with something of that personality which they do actually reflect, without conceiving of them as partaking of those attributes of mind which we everywhere recognize in their working results.—*Argyle's Reign of Law*, p. 87.

Mr. Tyndall says: "The problem of the connection between body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the pre-scientific ages. There ought to be clear distinction made between science in the stage of hypothesis (assumption) and science in the state of fact.  
\* \* \* I share Virchow's opinion that the theory of evolution in its complete form involves the assumption that at some period or other of the earth's history there occurred what would be now called spontaneous generation. I agree with him that the proof of it is still wanting. I hold with Virchow that the failures have been lamentable, that the doctrine is utterly discredited."

It is an underlying or first belief that governs all our courts, in their estimate of evidence, that things are as our senses report them to us. It lies at the beginning of all scientific reasoning. In all courts it is the basis of all credible evidence, the power of conscious knowledge underlies all judicial decisions. It is the essential

qualification of all qualified witnesses, but it is worth no more when it testifies to the reports which our senses make to it, than it is when it testifies that intelligent correlations imply intelligence, and that contrivances and adaptations of means to ends imply intelligence. All rational beings concede this to be true until their attention is called to matters of religion. Even secularists have made a great ado over the old stone ax and chips of flint. If we accept the proposition, as do the courts, that things are as our senses report them to us, then, if we do not condemn ourselves in that thing which we allow, we must accept design in nature ; otherwise we act the part of unreasonable men.

## A LIVING INTELLIGENCE OR DEAD ATOMS, WHICH?

The double nature of man is the only key that unlocks and opens the way to a correct understanding of his character. And the incorporeal substance theory of the origin of the universe is the only theory that will sustain the axioms of science.

The physical-force theory is an utter failure in the philosophy of life, sensation, consciousness, understanding and free will. If the forces of dead atoms, inherent in the atoms, were the cause of all things, the creative cause, then they were without anything to stand upon—were the mechanical powers of an unmade machine in process of making itself. From whence came life? Not from matter, for it was dead—inertia characterized our planet when it was no more than a mineral kingdom. And even admitting that physical forces existed at that time they were inadequate to the production of life with all the attributes of a living intelligence. Life is not from the physical forces of dead atoms. These could not place a thing never having had an existence where it was not, for a thing can not exist—be, and not exist—not be, at the same



time. To get a vital force out of a dead thing without a vital force to act upon it is like raising a dead body to life by the stroke of a mace. Vital forces stand upon vital nature, and physical forces stand upon physical nature. So the physical forces were not before physical nature, and for that very reason they could not have been the creative cause of physical nature. The advocates of the physical-force theory of creation say they can't believe that the dead body of the Nazarene was raised to life, but they can believe that all things which live were raised from the dead mineral kingdom by the physical forces of that kingdom.

It is an impossibility for the forces of a thing to exist before the thing itself exists. There are two legs to this universe of ours, one is the incorporeal and the other the corporeal. A man trying to get through the sciences on the corporeal leg alone is in a worse predicament than the man who has nothing but cork legs. Try to get away with the law of biogenesis—that life only produces life. You can't get any more out of anything than there is in it.

When you go back to the dead mineral kingdom you are standing on the shores of a gulf, which you will never cross by the light of the materialistic philosophy, with a number of axioms in your mind which your philosophy condemns as false while your intuitive knowledge, or com-



mon sense, tells you they are the most certain of all truths.

The human mind is so noble that it abhors a contradiction, and this fact has been called a law of mind, because of its being universally so. The Bible records, and especially the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, are in deadly conflict with the physical-force philosophy of the creation of all things. They contradict each other.

It is natural for materialistic secularists to say, science contradicts the Bible simply because the Bible contradicts them. Matter is their only substance, their all, the only basis for either science or religion. Some of them tell us, life is only a modification of matter. This is the best that atheists can say, and it does not help them out of their troubles, for there must be the modifier, and there must be that which conditions ; both modification and condition are effects. And it is known in science that life modifies and conditions, changing dead matter into living organic nature. We have one condition of matter in the horns of animals, another in the wool upon the sheep's back, and still another in hair upon the horse. What is it that conditions matter so very differently in different things? The horse and sheep are both ruminants, live on the same kinds of food. The sheep has a fore-stomach—chews his cud, but the horse has no fore-stomach,

chews no cud ; he has no contrivance for that kind of business. Why this difference? Answer, the Great Contriver made it so. He is the living intelligence who would have it so. No life, no modification. No life, no contrivance. No life, no diversity of conditions with one and the same substance. No life, no modifications. Life puts matter into the condition of living. Mind differentiates conditions.

The last link in the causal chain or analysis of life is will as existing in the incorporeal nature. Will lies along the mental line of existence all the way back to the original will, which lies behind all living beings. This is, so far as the will of man, at least, is concerned a matter of conscious knowledge, and we may say of it, as we do of life itself: There is no will without antecedent will. The law that life only produces life carries along with it the attributes of the living personality ; no will without antecedent will ; no mind without antecedent mind ; no moral nature without antecedent moral nature, and no matter without antecedent substance, and all this is in harmony with the axiom, "out of nothing, nothing comes."

The heavenly Father of spirits is called "the king eternal, immortal, invisible." In this quotation the original term for duration is in the plural form, and is to be understood as asserting that He is king of both eternities, the past as

well as the future ; in fact, the king of all the ages. Eternal substance, and an eternal incorporeal Intelligence there was, and is, and forever will be.

Here we dismiss a batch of infidel nonsense, such as, "A God sitting away back yonder, having nothing, seems so lonely." The mighty God is called the everlasting Father, which is a part of the name which our Savior, Jesus Christ, inherited. See *Heb.*, 2:4. No antecedent father, no offspring. This holds good in the world of spirits.

Things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. *Heb.*, 11:3. No incorporeal nature, no corporeal nature. No incorporeal nature, no life. The body without the spirit is dead, being alone. Life is not a property of matter, for in this case it would be found wherever and whenever matter is found, and this would forever destroy the distinction between the living organic kingdoms of nature and the old dead mineral kingdom over which the waters of the silurian age rolled their billows. Life is incomprehensible, and therefore undefinable ; it is a simple, and therefore can not be simplified ; it has in itself nothing in common with dead matter. To affirm that it has would destroy the distinction between a man and a corpse. Dead matter has no efficient power to place itself upon

the throne, or even to perpetuate the species it represented while in a state of life.

The advocates of the physical-force philosophy of all things go away back, in thought, along their hypothetical evolutionary line, saying, it took millions of years to bring about the present condition of things, while science teaches us that at a comparative recent period our earth was too hot for the existence of organic life upon its surface. And then for our ancestral fathers, they refer us to the weak, senseless, headless, boneless Ascidians, which exist to-day along our own shores in our great waters.

And here they tell us "conscience originated from the pleasures and pains of our far away Ascidian forefathers." Can it be possible that men of sense will accept the headless, boneless Ascidian as the source of anatomy, physiology, and psychology? Oh! they have *also* gone away back to the dead mud of the mineral kingdom; to the mud of the Nile; to the sun's rays falling upon sea slime, *anywhere will do for them!* So down goes the axiom, that "you can get no more out of a thing than there is in it." They go back until they get away from father and mother, away from axioms, away from involution behind evolution, and away from God, and claim years enough to place them in the internal heat of mother earth. And all this to make out their case.



I suggest that person never was involved in thing, and therefore never was evolved out of thing. By the way, what is the difference between getting more out of a thing than there is in it and creating something of nothing? The old Greek Anaximander, who was born 610 years before the Christ, was the author of the idea that our forefathers were submarine molusks, without heads, bones or limbs. After an unknown time, or a few millions of years, their offspring got out on land and lost their qualifications for living under the water, and during a long period of time swung tails; but after awhile threw their tails away and appeared as men—yes, were really men, no longer going on all fours but walking upright, But the original fellows were lost “in South Africa,” or somewhere “in a sunken continent south of Asia,” so that the missing link has never been found. There are a lot of things here yet with tails and ribs all loose, walking on all fours, evolving no new species, and in their native homes, living in the bushes. And now the only use we have for them is to place their pictures in our high school books, showing their regular advance up to manhood.

Oh! When will our learned men cease to perpetuate their folly in the schools of our country? “Oh, the link is missing,” but we will bridge the gulf with monkeys—a bridge of forty spans, the largest gorilla brain ever discovered being



thirty cubic inches and the smallest human brain being seventy cubic inches, forty cubic inches being the difference. Man has a ball under his great toe, with three tendons entering into it to give him a spring, while none of the monkey tribes have a like contrivance. If any man thinks he is descended from an ape, lost or living, he ought to keep his opinion to himself, and not slander his forefathers. Elihu said : “There is a spirit in man and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.”—*Job, 32:8*. “The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.”—*Job, 33:4*.

The term sperma-to-zoa is composed of two words, sperma and zoon. Zoon is the genitive of zao. From this root zao the Greeks got their word *Zeus*—God, and the Romans got their term Jupiter from the same. So we are very near the throne when we get to this little word zao and its genitive zoo. Zao is defined by the word life, and the Greek word zoe-life is of the same family. There is something wonderful in this little word zao.

The spermatic fluid is the medium of connection between the living spirit and organic nature. The nervo-vital fluid is the investient of *the* spirit of life. It is the medium of connection between the incorporeal spirit and the corporeal organism. When the nervo-vital fluid does not circulate in the lower limbs they shrink away, because the

assimilation of food ceases in those parts of the body. The nervo-vital fluid is the reality that is the foundation of the beautiful figure, "Water of Life." The light intended in the figure is in the fact used as a figure. The nervo-vital fluid is the fact. In the vegetable kingdom the life is in the sap. No sap, no growth. All life in the kingdoms of nature is the result of union with invisible and incorporeal nature which we sometimes call spiritual nature. Life is the result of union with God in every department of His government, and this union is through incorporeal and invisible nature, differentiated by Him, and from Him. Hence the law of biogenesis, that life only produces life; this law stands upon the existence of that eternal living Intelligence, in whom life is eternal.

In the vegetable kingdom life is imparted to the germs by the pollen floating over the flowers, and by being carried and deposited upon them by the bees and insects that feed upon them. This fertilizing by brooding over is duplicated in the animal kingdom where there are no sexual organs. When the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters \* \* \* and the earth was liberated from her swaddling bands of cloud and thick darkness, her waters were filled with life. It was said to the virgin, the mother of the Nazarene, "The holy spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee."

Some years ago a noted secularist, and advocate of Darwin's theory, attended a preachers' meeting in Ohio, and being asked to talk he said the reason he never could believe, as the preachers, was because the immutable laws of nature required two parents to produce an offspring, whereas the Nazarene had but one. I read this in the report of the meeting, and it immediately occurred to me that he was mistaken about the Nazarene having but one parent, being ignorant of the facts of science, that germs were fertilized in both the vegetable and animal kingdoms without the use of sexual organs. And even if his statement were true as respects the general rule, the objection is futile in the presence of the infinite Creator. But how a man can talk thus and advocate Darwinism is incomprehensible to me, seeing that such men profess to believe the very opposite when they talk about the origin of species in connection with their assumed units lying at the beginning of their evolutionary series. And such men as deny to nature a personal God, assuming that all sprang in the first instance from atoms dead as grains of shot—such men are the most credulous persons; the faith they have in their speculations is the most blind imaginable. They can believe without evidence, and against evidence.

Those who deny the laws of biogenesis by denying the existence of eternal life in God, must



allow that the immutable laws of nature began the entire series of living beings with but one parent, and that one parent something like a mollusk in old ocean's bottom, wholly unlike any ape, to say nothing of man. A theory hung upon a thousand ifs, instead of *immutable laws*. I have said, all men live by faith, but there is a wonderful difference in that in which they believe. If we were deprived of all that we have by faith we would have comparatively little left. We live by faith in the testimony of others, not one man in a hundred demonstrates. But we are glad to know that the best men of earth in a moral sense know enough about first truths or axioms to keep them from sinking in "the gulf of gulfs" which lies between the dead mineral and the organic kingdoms of life. Our common sense teaches us that there is something connected with our physical nature which changes dead matter into living organic nature. And this is all that took place when Adam's body was made of the dust of the earth and had the breath of lives infused into his face.—See the original of *Genesis*, 2:7. "God formed man of the dust."

In the most distinct manner God shows us that man is a being, having a body and spirit distinctly and separately created; the body out of the dust of the earth, the spirit immediately breathed from God himself. Does not this strongly mark that the spirit and body are not the same

thing? The body derives its origin from the earth, or, as *aphar* implies, the dust; hence because it is earthly it is decomposable and perishable. Of the spirit it is said God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; *nishmath chaiyim*, the breath of LIVES, *i. e.*, animal and intellectual. While this breath of God expanded the lungs and set them in play, his inspiration gave both spirit and understanding.—*Adam Clark*. All scientists are compelled to admit that there was a time when dead matter took on life and form. And the power that caused it to do so once can do it again. The law “that life only produces life” underlies our religion as truly as it underlies animal and vegetable existence. Life is of God. He differentiates in each and every case. In organic nature bodies only perish, decay and go back to dust, while spirits return to God who gave them.

There are two philosophies—THE VITAL AND THE PHYSICAL. The physical-force philosophy has matter for its only substance. The vital-force philosophy claims an incorporeal substance connected with matter. All well-informed Christians indorse the vital-force philosophy, and all atheists and materialists indorse the physical-force theory. With them matter and its forces are the all of the universe.

The advocates of the vital-force system say there is, ever was, and forever will be an incor-



poreal nature connected with and permeating all living things in the visible organic kingdoms of vegetable and animal nature. And that our planet itself was thrown out from the invisible, so that things which are seen were made of unseen things.—*Heb.*, 11 chap. and 3d verse. Again unseen things are eternal.—*2 Cor.*, 4:18. Democritus said, “I am, therefore something is eternal,” recognizing the axiom, that out of nothing nothing comes; that involution lies behind evolution.

The sacred scriptures never said that all things were made of nothing. An eternal living intelligence and an eternal, incorporeal substance are the poles of the universe. In reproduction, going on in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, the life, which is the invisible builder, is something which no chemist has ever been able to find or logically explain. It causes each germ to fall into the line of its own paternity, or species, and seems to be connected with mind somewhere, because with a prophet’s eye it looks forward and provides in the old plant for the next generation; it wraps food around the germ of the plant which supports the germ until the plant gets roots and leaves sufficient to gather its own food from earth and air. The great mystery of life in the vegetable kingdom is in the pollen floating over the flowers. A very wise man said: “Vegetable life is union with God in the vegeta-

ble kingdom. His work is there, and the water of life is there ; it is in the flowing sap, which is the means of growth.”

No chemist has been able to duplicate vegetable nature with its qualities or properties. Nothing but the invisible life, in the germ and in the circulating sap, can make vegetable nature with its properties. All vegetable nature is thrown out from the invisible life of vegetable nature. The same is true in the animal kingdom. A chemist is always baffled when he undertakes to find an organic difference between fertilized and unfertilized eggs, because there is no difference, either in properties or proportions. All the organic matter that is in the one is in the other and in the same proportions, but life is in one and not in the other. You can kill fertilized eggs by putting them in cold water over night, or by piercing them with a needle. The truth is this, the life is inherent in an invisible, incorporeal and incomprehensible nature. The term “life” is ultimate ; beyond it you can not go. Its name is its only explanation. It is simple, therefore you can not simplify it ; it is connected with corporeal nature, but it is not corporeal. We are in a world of incorporeal substances. Webster defines the term “incorporeal” thus : Not having a material body ; not consisting of matter ; immaterial. He adds : “Spirits are deemed incorporeal substance.” But

why should I multiply words to prove the existence of incorporeal nature?

There is something in my body which duplicates the creative act by changing dead matter into living organic nature—a thing which no chemist can do. Animal nature comes from the invisible life in the spermatic fluid, which does its work by means of the circulating nervo-vital fluid. We know that a germ has life; and we know that life is incorporeal by the analysis of the fertilized and unfertilized eggs, and we know that the vital force changes dead matter into living organic nature by the law of assimilation. The life force, or germ builder, is from God, because “He that built all things is God.”—*Heb. 3:4*. “In, or by Him we live, move and have our being.”—*Acts 17:23-28*. Do you say this logic makes me a part of God? You might as well say I am a part of my father, as say my spirit is a part of the father of spirits. We are his *genos*—genus. So Paul said, standing on the hill of Mars. This same man said, “We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us \* \* \* Should we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of Spirits and live?” When the organism perishes the spirit returns to God who gave it. Galen and Plato both taught that the immediate organ, or instrument of sight, was a luciform and ethereal spirit.

In the physical system the chemical and phys-

ical agencies, or forces, disintegrating and tearing down, are, in a healthy state, overcome by the vital spirit, or living force, which has these physical forces to contend with from the cradle to the grave. As long as the vital can keep the mastery we can live, but no longer. By this antagonism we ought to know that life is neither a chemical nor a physical force. The vital force is separate and distinct from the forces of the non-living world; the fact that it builds all organisms demonstrates the truthfulness of this statement. And the chemical analysis of the two eggs, of which I have spoken, demonstrates the same.

Voltaire says: "Sometimes a wish will arise in us to know how we think, though we seldom feel an inclination to know how we digest, or how we walk. I have interrogated my reason and asked what it is? The question has always confounded me. \* \* \* I have observed so great a difference between my thoughts and my nourishment \* \* \* that I have believed there was a substance in me which reasoned and another which digested. However, in endeavoring always to prove to myself that we are two, I palpably felt that I am only one; and that contradiction has always given me extreme pain. \* \* \* I can not suppress the desire of being instructed; and my disappointed curiosity is ever insatiable."



## THE ORIGIN OF A CHRISTIAN IDEA.

The word atom, from *ha temno*, not cut, was first used with an incorporeal currency to designate a nature which no chemist can cut; in the times of Moses it expressed the Christian idea of all things being thrown out of the unseen, and incorporeal nature. So that we are not alone if we entertain the idea that all organized nature stands upon the ground of incorporeal and eternal substance. Moses taught the incorporeal atomic theory of creation. See Cudworth's True Intellectual System of the Universe, Vol. I, pp. 90 and 91. The proof is, Posidonius, an ancient and learned philosopher, Athenæus, and Arce-rius, the publisher of Jamblichus, so testify. In Jamblichus Moses is called *Moscus*, a Phœ-necian, and also in another dialect called *Mochus*. Gassendi and Clerk Maxwell both assert that physical atoms are prepared material. But it is enough to know that the very term in its etymology contradicts the theory that the origin of all things is from dead atoms of physical nature by means of physical forces.

It seems strange that an advocate of the physical-force theory of creation should choose the word *atom* in which to express his philosophy.



Democritus and Leucippus were the first to give the term a physical currency, and this they did in the interest of their atheism. There was a time when the germs of organic life *were not on our planet*, nor in its waters. At this point in time the lines are sharply drawn between life and death. Here we are on the shores of a dead mineral gulf—"the gulf of gulfs," lying between life and universal death. Was there life on the other side of this gulf, and did it cross over? Or must we chain our boats to the shores and look back and be forever lost to the origin of life and intelligence? Lost to moral nature and free will? Can we cross this gulf by the light of dead atoms? Or by the light of the physical forces? Or by the light of the materialistic philosophy?

In thought we stand upon the shores of universal death and ask where is life? Where is mind and moral nature? Where is free will? The physical-force theory of creation answers none of these questions. Does involution lie behind evolution? Then where were these things? Were they in dead mindless matter, or were they in an all-wise creator? The law that life only produces life is as well established as any law in the universe.

The very wise ones who are always talking their skepticism and unbelief, and advocating the physical-force theory have tried to cover all these difficulties with the blanket of oblivion, by simply

calling them "the unknown." Yes! they have a great deal to say about "the unknown;" seem to be very wise upon this subject. They have traveled so far into the unknown that they refuse to recognize a legitimate conclusion drawn from an axiom.

Darwin comes to "the gulf of gulfs" and looks and reflects, saying, I have always been a deist, why should I refuse to cross over? I'll not show myself so unscientific as to deny the law, that life only produces life, and that I know nothing about legitimate conclusions arising out of axioms. I'll just say to all the world, that "science demands a miracle to give us the unit or units lying at the beginning of the series of evolution." And so he crossed "the gulf of universal death" on the Christian's boat, and took hold on that eternal life and intelligence, "whose divinity and power, from the beginning of the world, hath been clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made." But it was not in Mr. Darwin to be infallible, for he denied design in nature, losing sight of God again, and virtually contradicting himself, for design in nature is certainly contained in the statement that "science demands a miracle," because all that was ever evolved from the unit or units was most certainly intended by him who wrought the miracle. "Out of nothing, nothing comes."

Some of Dr. Darwin's admirers have not

known either God or miracle, but have been so much concerned about the matter as to put forth their energies to find the beginning of the series of evolution in spontaneous generation of life and species from dead atoms. *And having utterly* failed they have concluded to live in the unknown and to be content with matter as the only substance; they have cut the universe in twain by denying the existence of incorporeal nature and chained their boat to the shores of the gulf of universal death, and given up the idea of ever getting across. Their boat, however, is loaded with broken-down axioms and laws, which their common sense recognizes as veritable truths. J. Hutchison Sterling marched up to the boat and said: We are in the presence of the one incommunicable gulf, the gulf of gulfs, which Mr. Huxley's protoplasm is as powerless to efface as any expedient that has ever been suggested since the eyes of men first looked into it, the mighty gulf between life and death. Then Mr. Huxley having tormented them by saying, all really scientific experience tells us that life can be produced by a living antecedent only, proceeds to administer a little consolation to the disappointed by saying the present state of knowledge furnishes us with no link between the living and the not living. And they respond: We will live in the unknown if we are lost in the gulf; so they have staked themselves off from



God and a future life, while the gulf is being crossed by thousands in the light of the axioms of science, religious belief and demonstrative reasoning. The law that life only produces life is the real centripetal cord binding us forever to the great fountain of life, which is the source of all life and intelligence. If I know that axioms are true I know there is an eternal living intelligence. With me His existence is a question of knowledge carried into consciousness by legitimate conclusions drawn from axioms, while His character in a moral sense and His will concerning us are questions of faith learned from His own revelation to mankind.

Voltaire crossed the gulf in these words: "The God of the Jews, I again repeat, is the God of all nature."—*Philosophic Dictionary*, p. 34. The Divine Being has placed His seal upon the organic kingdoms so effectually that the very best minds can never successfully transfer them to blind, physical forces, nor to chance.

There is *no* such thing as force without energy, because it is the manifestation of energy, and this requires will behind it; as there is no seeing without the sense of sight, so there is no energy without mind. How long would it take a pile of type, by their own inertia, to place themselves in such a position as to be at once a fine lecture? Atheists and all others who deny design in nature advocate that for dead atoms which is far

more ridiculous than the idea of a fine undesigned lecture.

There are two items in the physical-force theory of creation. First, that creation is only new modifications of matter. But modifications must stand upon a modifier; second, that matter is the only substance, and therefore whatever is made is made of matter by its own forces. But the forces of matter must stand upon matter, and therefore could never create matter. Axiom, no matter, no forces of matter. No physical nature, no physical forces. Physical forces stand upon physical nature. So the advocates of the physical-force philosophy of creation have their cart always before their horse. What would you think of a man claiming that he begat his own father? This is exactly like the physical force theory of creation. No physical nature, no laws of physical nature. The laws of nature never existed until nature first existed. The forces of nature never existed until nature first existed. So the laws of nature and the forces of nature never created nature.

Life and mind must be first in nature's order. No vital nature, no vital forces. No mental nature, no mental forces. Dispense with the idea of creation by an incorporeal, ever-living intelligence and you are logically driven by the force of axioms to the idea of a chance world, or to a denial altogether of any creation at all.



No man, among all those who have opposed the Bible account of creation, has ever yet given an adequate cause of creation that was in harmony with well-known axioms, nor such a cause for the existence of any created thing. Instinct, mind and free-will are not properties, nor qualities of matter. Dead matter never begat them, neither were they ever involved in dead matter; therefore were never evolved out of, or from, dead matter, for this would be getting more out of the thing than there was in it, which would be equal to creating something of nothing.

Mr. Darwin says: "Man is developed from an ovule about the one hundred and twenty-fifth of an inch in diameter, which differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals. The embryo itself, at a very early period, can hardly be distinguished from that of other members of the vertebrate kingdom." What is it that differentiates species, causing each to fall into line with its own paternity and also determines the sex with reference to future offspring? The answer is found in the fact that there is in each an invisible, incorporeal spiritual nature, from which the embryo itself proceeds, which, in the case of man, is endowed with reason and understanding, and all that elevates man above the nature of mere beasts made for man's use. The invisible universe is the source of the visible, from which all organic nature in both vegetable and animal

life ever did, does and will proceed. This is the mystery in which we dwell, and of which Mr. Tyndall spake, saying, with reference to the materialistic idea of the origin of all things: "I, myself, like other men, have my brighter hours, and it is not in these that I am inclined to this philosophy; in them my soul shrinks from it as a philosophy that furnishes no solution of the mysterious problem of human existence, in which we dwell and of which we form a part."

In all the world of mind the prototype of every created thing is first in the mind. So mind is the source of things, the ultimate of the existence of things. Everything is known by the vigor and activity of that which knows, and its action is not involuntary, for it is not under the reign of physical laws; its action depends upon a free will, which the physical laws have never accounted for. This free will presides over the voluntary nerves which are connected with the upper brain, or cerebrum, while the involuntary are connected with the lower, or cerebellum, and with the heart, lungs, liver, stomach and kidneys. Physical laws reign here, but free will reigns in the kingdom of the voluntary nerves. That which is voluntary is done by design, purposed, intended, done freely, or of choice. The man who designs, purposes or intentionally kills another is a murderer, while the man who, with-

out any such intention or purpose, lops a tree and in its descent it kills a man is not a murderer.

We now have before us the grounds of all accountability. It is free will with design, intention or purpose, one or all; these condemn, while necessity, or the opposite, excuses. Upon these principles men are condemned or acquitted in all our courts.

Sending men, in your thoughts, to heaven or hell by irresistible influences, is to utterly disregard, in thought, the justice of God, for in this case neither the one nor the other would be entitled to rewards. You might, with equal propriety, tell me that some will get to heaven because their blood circulates, and that others would be punished because their liver secretes bile.

## FREEDOM, THE BASIS OF EQUAL RIGHTS; AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

Moral freedom is exactly the opposite of necessity ; it is freedom to do or let it alone, to do or not do. Man is not a necessitated being in a moral and religious sense. I know that it is claimed that the strongest motive necessitates. This is the same as to say, man is a creature of circumstances only, but this is untrue. The strongest motive does not necessitate action, because action may be deferred for a time, and often is until it is too late, that is for all time. The motive itself depends upon the mind's preference for its being the strongest motive ; conclusion, the mind governs. Choice is the result of mental action ; men investigate and then choose. But they do not investigate without choosing to do so. Men rise above and sink below their circumstances, are continually changing their circumstances, are free to do so or let it alone. The opposite of this places all men upon the same irresponsible plane as respects all society and all governments, destroying the distinction between sober intellectual reason and emotional insanity, because men necessitated by the strongest motives are driven by the emotions produced,



and no more can be said of the criminal in law who is acquitted upon the ground of emotional insanity. All men do not act alike under the same circumstances. The same man does not always act alike under the same circumstances. A man will at one time accept a motive and act, and at another he will reject the same motive and not act.

We are familiar with that old saying "You can't do it again," and this proves that the controlling power is mind, and not motive, and that the mind is free to accept a motive and act, or to reject a motive and not act. A man may accept a motive and procrastinate action indefinitely, and this also proves that in action the mind governs. All other freedom is slavery, is necessity, and this is destructive of the foundations of all justice in all civil governments; it is fatalism; it discloses a man as a machine to be acted upon. It assumes that man being necessitated in both mental and moral action is not to be held accountable; is not to be blamed, and therefore there is no such contrast as that between vice and virtue; no such thing as sin. In this system vice ceases to be vice and virtue ceases to be virtue.

How much do the laws of this system differ from the laws that govern the stone? Is there any moral nature where all is necessity? Do we ever speak of moral nature in connection with the waters that flow in their channels? Can a



rational man attribute praise or blame, vice or virtue to the stone? If he can not, can he attribute either to a man who is necessitated in his conduct and character, ground out of the mills by uncontrollable circumstances? All our boasted morality, viewed in the light of the evolutionary mill of necessity, reminds us of the doctor who cured the fever by killing his patient.

If a man did not create himself he may be responsible. Can a man be responsible without moral freedom? Can the mind through the activities of its own nature be the cause of a volition or choice? The mind itself may be the cause of effects in itself, as well as out of itself. If it can not, then we have effects without a cause, which is an absurdity. Bacon said: "He who reasons must have something to reason from, and something to reason to. We choose to reason, and reasoning in the mind also lies behind that action of the mind which we call choice or will." If you ask me why the mind is active in the way it is, I answer, it is because it is an intelligent creative first cause, able to determine what course will suit it best. And by virtue of its intelligence, and its consequent ability to judge of the future, it is a creative first cause, acting freely without compulsion or necessity.

The hypothesis of necessity is the unbeliever's short method of murdering religion. But here they lay off their manhood just as the doctor laid

away his patient to cure the fever. It is true that infants come into the world under diverse circumstances, but they do not long remain infants, and even here the theory fails, for those who come under the most unfavorable circumstances often make the best of citizens. And those most fortunate in their earliest surroundings often make the worst; men do not remain under the circumstances of their childhood days. A. Campbell said: "All men who have not philosophized themselves beyond the region of common-sense, allow that sober reason is stronger than moral or immoral attraction, and therefore allow that all persons who reason are surrounded with responsibilities for their action. We do not think of blaming infants until their minds are somewhat developed."

Make the chain of evolution as strong as you will; bind man down to nature by every muscle, and every nerve and bioplastic cell of his body, if you can, and then the greater part of him remains unaccounted for. His free will, which is his prime factor and characteristic and moral nature, takes him out of the category of the material world, and exempts him from its destiny. In fact, will is reigning king over the voluntary nerves. Mr. Darwin says: "Free will is a mystery insoluble to the naturalist. Evolution can not account for consciousness of identity,

nor for abstract conceptions, nor for moral obligations nor for free will."

Tyndall says: "The chasm between brain action and consciousness is impassable; here lies a rock upon which the materialistic philosophy must split when it pretends to be a philosophy of the human mind. There are two parts of man's nature: molecular processes, with involuntary perpetual action, on one side, and conscious identity, moral sense and free will on the other. So we need not trouble ourselves with anything physical evolution may assert of us, because it can not touch us as conscious moral beings. With our freedom of will we are above the reign of physical laws, and of physical evolution. These two sides of our being, with the chasm lying between them, are recognized by all respectable scientists. They wonderfully contrast with each other. We have the voluntary and involuntary nerves, one set for the free will, the other for physical laws. Materialism will not bridge this gulf. There is a world for my physical nature, for one side of my being. Is there one for the other? Do I need another? Do I not find myself at liberty to believe in that which I need? To believe in an unseen world for my unseen nature; for the hidden man of the heart, "the meek and quiet spirit, which, in the sight of God, is of great price."

Secularists, before they got into their non-



theological edition, and Christians both believed in the rights of man from a theological standpoint. The doctrine of equal rights rested, where it does yet with Christians, upon the belief that men had what is commonly called souls. As tried at the tribunal of knowledge and calm intellect the social doctrine rests upon the religious. Robespierre rested his declaration of rights on this foundation. It was just here that the whole case of slavery found its death. "Colored men have souls to save as well as white men." Both have the same God to serve, before whom, in their soul nature, they are equal. Such belief made the suppression of slavery possible. Without this belief Wilberforce would have been without power, and Uncle Tom's cabin without pathos. Theism and the rights of man, heretofore, were convertible terms. But secularists, who proclaim with zeal that theism and religion are delusions, forget that in their secularism the rights of man may turn out to be a delusion, and that instead of being recognized more fully in the future there may be none left to recognize.

One of this school, in America, said: "Entire equality of rights implies entire equality in nature, and as the latter does not exist, the former will never exist in the law of natural morality." How will this do in practice? Where is their basis for equal rights? They have none. Natural morality is limited to what men know of right



and wrong naturally. It never built a civilization. It has mercy for near relatives and friends, but for enemies it has none. It is pagan ground, being exclusively natural. Repudiating soul-nature they can't find a basis for equal rights to stand upon. They deny that men are equal. They are forced to this conclusion by their views of the origin and character of the human family.

This is not all; they insist that men are unequal, and they do it with a fullness of meaning which was inconceivable until they got into their non-theological edition. No slave autocrat ever implied this doctrine of inequality so fully as secularists do in their materialistic philosophy. All its tendencies are to show, if possible, with increasing clearness, that each man is the creature of his circumstances, that of his human value his body is the index, and that men's inequalities are not only real, but greater than they appear to be. They have no souls to place them on common ground of equality. If a man was in the least degree other than he has been, to the eyes of secularists he would have been another man. With them what each man is is all he could have been. So to talk about equality between men and men is as absurd as to talk of equality between dogs as dogs and horses as horses. And possibly more absurd, because men as men, when viewed from their standpoint as

evolved from lower animals, differ as much, if not more. There are sayages who, placed simply in the scale of animals, are nearer the highest order of animals than they are to the highest order of their own species. And if creatures so far removed from each other as some men are from others, in a physical point of view, can be regarded as equals when considered out of relations to God and the future, through soul-nature within them, then we may say dogs are equal to dogs and cats are equal to horses.

Rights must be sanctioned or they amount to nothing; must be sanctioned by an authority that can see that they will be granted. Of whom do we claim them? Here we are again left to religious belief. God will execute so that every man will receive according to his deeds, and all wrongs will be avenged. The opposite of all this is the old idea that human might makes right. Conscience is an imperious voice within us, equally so in all of us. This is admitted on all sides. How is this to be accounted for? Secularists claim that conscience is an inherited instinct, developed slowly from the pains and pleasures of our far-away ascidian forefathers; that it has been thousands and thousands of years evolving itself. For argument's sake let us admit this to be true, and what secularists insist upon will by no means stop here. They declare that though conscience be thus placed in thought, it will yet in practice

suffer no change in its powers, because men's environments through the ages have made them what they are. This second statement is involved in the first, so conscience, gaining its power all along the line of its evolutionary progress, is as much a necessary part of a necessitated being as any member of the physical organism. Can we therefore get rid of it? Can we be asked to modify it? Can we do it?

It is also involved in secularism that, although conscience had its origin in social instincts, these instincts have gained their present power by being taken for something more than social instincts; that they have, as a matter of history, been obliged to translate themselves into an articulate formula of religious belief, and in fact into all religious beliefs. So all religions are the creatures of evolution, and the result of natural selection, and therefore just as natural as natural morality necessitated! Secularists claim that conscience was not only evolved from the unresolving impulses of natural instinct, but that it fulfills a double function, or office, at once making laws and enforcing them. But in explaining how it has come to do the first, they have robbed it of its freedom to do the second. So all they can justly do in any practical direction is to show us that they desire that each and every man should follow his own conscience. As yet they have produced no reasons why this should not be



the rule of action, but at present they must seek for reasons in some other school than their own.

And this brings us to a matter of great importance to our country ; and that is, whether the foundations of human rights, and the civil and religious liberties of the millions, shall be ignored. In secularism this has already been done, at the expense of contradicting their own theory concerning the evolution of conscience, and equally against religious beliefs as the result of natural selection. But, perhaps, it will take as long to devolve our conscience and religion as it did to evolve them. If every man is just what ancestral influences made him through the ages past, operating upon him, he can be no more, nor less, than what he is, and why try to make him more or less in a day, or by law?

Take away human freedom by this Moloch of necessity and then talk of freedom ! Talk of liberty ! Such is the climax of absurdities. It is an insult to the common sense of mankind. According to this evolutionary necessity we want to know where freedom comes in and what it is. So no one need expect that the religious consciousness will die away, or will change the lines of its evolution. Its specialties of forms once strongly marked may, if not tenable, gradually fade away, but the religious consciousness, the object-matter, will persist or continue. That the object-matter can be supplanted by another ob-



ject-matter, as supposed by secularists, who talk about a religion without God, a religion without a future life, is a belief countenanced neither by induction nor by deduction.

Herbert Spencer has said: "However dominant may be the moral sentiment enlisted on behalf of humanity, it can never exclude the sentiment alone properly religious, because it is awakened by that which lies behind humanity, and behind all other things. The child, by wrapping its head in the 'bed-e-lohes,' may for a moment get rid of the light, but the consciousness survives, and imagination persists in occupying itself with that which lies in the unseen. No such religion as a religion of humanity, pertaining wholly to the human, can ever do more than temporarily shut out the thought of a power, of which humanity is but a small and fugitive product, which was in course of ever-changing manifestation before humanity was, and will continue through other manifestations when humanity has ceased to be."—*Popular Science Monthly*, July, 1873.

In the above quotation it is claimed that the object-matter of religion is involved once for all in consciousness, and in evolution, and if in, how are secularists going to get it out? They may wrap their heads in the bed-e-lohes, and shut out the great companion momentarily, but consciousness will still persist, and they will always be as

they are, troubling themselves about the *unknown*. After awhile they may give Him another name. May it not be the "known and knowable." This would be a grand rebuke to those who say in their hearts "there is no God." If you shut the Great One out temporarily He will still exist in your imagination. Can you succeed in wiping out of consciousness the elements of revealed religion? God and a future life? Spencer says, "No!" and we say, No!

Voltaire says: "My reason alone proves to me a being who has arranged the matter of this world." The man who finds no better name for the great Father of Spirits, and creator of all things, than the name, "the unknown," is steeped all over, eyes and ears, in mysticism. While I am in this world I want to know a great deal more than I can comprehend. The more I know of the incomprehensible the more I shall profit in both science and religion, because the fundamental truths and facts of both are the foundation elements of both. I do not comprehend my own mental capacities and powers, nor that thing called life, yet I know them as veritable realities. When Daniel Webster was in the prime of his manhood he was in the company of a number of literary gentlemen, lawyers, physicians, merchants and statesmen, sitting at a table dining. During their conversation Webster stated his belief in the divinity of the Christ, and his

dependence upon Him. A noted gentleman sitting opposite to him said: "Mr. Webster, can you comprehend how Jesus Christ could be both divine and human?" Mr. Webster, with one of those looks, which no man can imitate, said: "No sir, I can not comprehend it; and I would be ashamed to acknowledge Him as my Savior if I could. If I could comprehend Him, He could be no greater than myself, and such is my conviction of accountability to God, and sense of sinfulness before him, and knowledge of my own incapacity to recover myself, that I feel I need a super-human Savior."

Renan said: "In the first rank of this grand family of the true sons of God we must place Jesus. Jesus has no visions. God does not speak to Him from without. God is in Him. He feels that He is with God, and He draws from His heart what He says of His Father. He lives in the bosom of God by uninterrupted communication. He does not see Him, but He understands Him without need of thunder and burning-bush like Moses, of a revealing tempest like Job, of an oracle like the old Greek sages, of a familiar genius like Socrates, or of an angel Gabriel like Mohammed.

"The sentiment which Jesus introduced into the world is really ours. His perfect idealism is the highest rule of unworldly virtuous life. He has created that heaven of free-souls in which is

found that for which we ask in vain, the perfect nobility of the children of God, absolute purity, total abstraction from the contaminating influences of the world ; that freedom, in short, which material society shuts out as an impossibility, and which finds all its amplitude only in the domain of thought. The great master of those who take refuge in this ideal kingdom of God is Jesus still. He first proclaimed the Kingliness of the Spirit. He first said, at least by his acts : 'My kingdom is not of this world.' The foundation of the true religion is indeed His work. After Him, there is nothing more but to develop and fructify.'"—*Renan's Life of Jesus*, p. 365.



## ARTIFICIAL OR NATURAL JUSTICE, WHICH?

Secularists who make so much ado about "liberty of man, woman and child," allow that nature brought us into the world without any fetters or shackles, free from all obligations, justice and morality, they being only hindrances to true liberty. Their philosophy is that nature absolutely disassociates men and women, by giving them diverse and contrary appetites, or desires, and consequently that every person is at war with every other person in a natural state, and that the gratification of our appetites and desires is the only measure of good in nature, and, therefore, there is not and can not be anything naturally just or unjust, nothing in itself naturally unlawful, or sinful, but that a man by nature has a right to everything, even other men's labor and lives. If he desires a man's life he has naturally liberty to kill, and may do so without committing any injustice or sin, because his right is that of unlimited liberty.

It is further claimed, that though this, their natural state of liberty from all justice, there being no such thing in nature, and liberty from all obligations, and a lawless, loose, unlimited right

to everything—being the best, yet, by reason of men's want of strength, feebleness of body and mind, and diversity of appetites, it proves to be the worst; because by nature, they say, every man is at war with every other man, and this, practically, makes man's liberty to everything a liberty to nothing. According to these tenets men must be sensible in a natural state of more evil than good, and in order to experience more good than evil their natural liberty must be circumscribed, or we must have anarchy and universal conflict. This being the state of the case, it is claimed, that after men were a long while slashing and warring against each other, getting weary and tired, they thought it best, and necessary, by human skill, to help their own weakness by choosing a lesser evil, so they consented to modify their unlimited right to everything by submitting to terms of equal rights for the sake of peace and security, and, therefore, put themselves under a civil, common, coercive power, whose will, being the will of all, should be the rule and measure of justice. This is the language of secularism upon the origin of justice. So, true justice is not a nature, but an accident, based upon fear, the fear of the stronger. Plato describes it in these words :

“They say, therefore, that by nature, lawless liberty and to do that which is now called injustice and injury to other men is good, but to

suffer it from others is evil ; but of the two there is more of evil in suffering it than of good in doing it, because men of might and power were always in the minority ; and when men had clashed a good while, doing and suffering injury, the greater part, who by reason of their weakness of body and mind were not able to take the former without the latter, at length compromised the business among themselves, entering into covenants with each other to neither do nor suffer injury, but to submit to rules of equality, and to make laws by compact, in order to their peaceable cohabitation, they calling that which was required by the name of justice, regarding justice as a certain middle thing between the best and the worst ; the best to exercise a lawless liberty of doing as one pleases without suffering from it, and the worst to suffer evil from others without being able to avenge themselves. So justice is loved, not as that which is good in itself, but as that which is made good by men's inability to exercise themselves in the enjoyment of unbridled liberty and liberalism."

With secularists justice and obligation are both artificial, mere accidents arising from men's fear and imbecility. These advocates of liberty from the fear of God, and the fear of future rewards, are compelled by their own philosophy to found their politics and morals in the fear that the stronger will, in the exercise of their natural lib-

erty, inflict evil upon the weaker, changing the object of fear from the stronger man to the civil magistrate, being forced to enter into covenants creating governments and artificial justice. And now they try to recommend themselves to the civil authorities, by trying to persuade them that the fear of any superior power is degrading and destructive of civil authority. Their system, if it may be so called, first of all villainizes humanity. Its foundation is the thought that human nature has not the least germ of goodness or of equity in it. With them everything in human character is the result of fear, weakness and poverty, all private and selfish appetite, sensual pleasure and utility.

There is nothing in such teachings to save any government from being oppressive through wealth and power ; these are their only evolutions. Ignoring the spiritual in man, the best with them is a lawless liberty, one and identical with anarchy. All that saves them from being practically anarchists now is, according to their own statements, the fear of suffering at the hands of the stronger. But, in justice to them, I must say that they claim to have alienated their natural right, or at least a part of it, to others whom they fear, so that it will become unlawful for them to carry out the principles of anarchy.

A civil government does not create natural rights. By legislation it may create privileges,



but rights it does not. It may assume a power that does not belong to it, but this would be oppression. It is the proper business of legislative bodies to make laws to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights. A civil government has no more right to enact a wrong than an individual. A civil government can make itself very uncivil by enacting laws in conflict with natural rights. "Framing mischief by a law" always was a very blameworthy thing. But some secularists have said, men are naturally bound by their covenants, obliged to stand by them. And so they enter into compacts by covenants, and do this through fear of the stronger. Thus they get from the artificial to the natural, and by the natural obligate men to the artificial.

All this dancing around in a circle to prove that there is no such thing as natural justice reminds me of a man trying to tie knots in a whirlwind. It is certainly a climax in the absurd. The ligaments with which those men tie the bones together in their artificial man of justice—natural rights—unlimited liberty and covenanted obligations, are no more than cobwebs. They, being no more than man's will, through fear, may be unmade by the same authority when it is confident of success in the undertaking. Their artificial justice, sovereignty and obligations, holding them together, and uniting in one body politic those who are naturally divided, and each and every

one having a natural right to all things and to unlimited liberty, will always be productive of rebellions and anarchy.

These men are driven from art to force and power, and make even their magistrates to rule in fear. *See Hobbes' Leviathan, ch. 16.* But in case the only obligation to be loyal to one's country be from the dread or fear of punishment by the stronger, then no man or set of men could be obliged to lay themselves upon their country's altar for the preservation of its existence, but might violate its laws and repudiate their membership in the civil compact whenever they might think it to their advantage to do so, for whatever is made by human might may be unmade by human might or force; for in this philosophy civil government, about which so much has been written, is nothing more than human in its origin, and all civil rights are based wholly upon human might.

Christians who believe that civil magistrates and civil powers were ordained of God never advocate things fraught with such absurd consequences, but those who do are one-world men. There is so much of the good and sensible in human nature that it has been said men everywhere continually drop into political order; that the corruption of one form of government is the generation of another. And if so, civil government is neither artificial nor violent, but nat-

ural. There is necessarily a natural bond, which holds people together, which has the Divine seal upon it, and that is the social nature of man. Man is naturally a social being, made for society, both domestic and civil. In civil government the natural bond is natural justice, which is the chief concern in all our courts of justice. To this all unabused consciences consent; therefore, the golden rule, "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," is perfectly natural. It is also in harmony with the doctrine of equal rights based upon equality of soul nature.

If there was nothing in its own nature just nor unjust there could be no obligation at all. There is nothing which has the sanction of conscience sooner than simple justice. If civil governments wish to destroy themselves they have only to utterly disregard natural justice and conscience. Natural justice is the vertebra of the civil body. When it is reached every controversy should end. Impartial justice and the good of the whole ever did and ever will clash with the claims of unlimited liberty, and a right to everything in one's power. Lawless liberty is fraught with all manner of evil consequences, both to those who strive to enjoy it and to others. Men in our country trying it have gone to both the penitentiary and the gallows, and others have plunged themselves into seas of blood.

## ALL MEN LIVE BY FAITH.

Science furnishes philosophy with facts to work upon. The two are inseparably connected. Philosophy terminates its work by reaching the first cause of all things, which is the underlying truth in the Christian religion. Science ends in the beginning of philosophy, and philosophy ends in the beginning of Bible history. The ultimate of inductive philosophy is in these words: In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Science, philosophy and religion are a trinity in unity. Faith is an essential element in each of these.

Are you a student in astronomy? Have you measured the radius of the earth? or observed the movement of the planets? or calculated the distance of the sun from other planets? or the distance from the center of the earth's orbit to the center of the sun? Would we consider ourselves able to fix the instruments for such a calculation? We were never within a hundred miles of the necessary position for such observations. They were made in Lapland in 1769, and also in Tahiti. We have accepted these astronomical measurements upon the testimony of men.

Are you a student in geology? Have you read



the Stone book extensively? Have you examined the fossils of the different localities, which are so many pointers to the science? Have you seen them in their proper places? No, you depend upon the testimony of men who have made a specialty of the study, and the veracity of authors, assisting you by maps of ideal formations pictured off in indigo-blue, brimstone yellow and pink. Are you students in chemistry, proud of the certainty of demonstration? How much of the science is experimental with you? Have you analyzed nine hundred and forty-two substances, or the twentieth part of them? No, you receive your knowledge upon the testimony of others. You could not live long enough to verify one-half of the discoveries in the sciences? We live in the sciences by faith, as we do in religion. All the cant we hear about the uncertainty of religion and the certainty of science is misleading and largely absurd. Scientists take as much by faith as Christians. They wrap themselves up in as much second-hand assurance as Christians, and have been as badly confused by rival opinions. The sciences commenced with more ignorance than our religion; they were patched up year by year and century after century by new discoveries, now received by faith in the testimony of others.

Science is knowledge systematized, based upon first truths; but if there is no design in nature,

no order, no plan, then there can be no system or science. We do not comprehend confusion in nature. We are so constituted that we expect order; we are always searching after it. Belief in cause and effect is a first belief, a primitive belief, because it always was and always will be common to all rational minds. Without this faith natural law would never have been known. The natural sciences are based upon natural laws, and natural laws are known in uniform effects, which are called natural laws. Cause and effect underlie all natural sciences; they are the first principles of the sciences. Our knowledge in the sciences rests upon faith and our faith upon the knowledge of evidence. We sow seeds without certainty of a good crop, but we sow in faith based upon uniform results. Deprive us of faith and we fall back upon pagan ground. We could have no civilization without faith. In religion it is written: "The just shall live by faith."

The common faith of the world is based upon the evidences of the seen, and the faith of the just is based upon the evidences of the unseen. Young Pollock told the truth when he said, "All faith is one in kind, in object the difference lies." We have great need of faith. On what principle do we receive bank bills in payment for property? It is faith. On what principles do unbelievers put religion beyond the sphere of faith? It would bother them to tell how man, connected

by his five senses with this world alone, came in possession of those ideas which belong to another world.

Faith is the bond of companionship, and companionship is the true philosophy of happiness. If I were alone upon the earth and gold mines were all around me, the discovery of one fresh human foot-print in the sand would fill me with more anticipated joy than an everlasting, scientific solitude with gold on every hand.

One of the favorite arguments of unbelievers in Christianity is, that geology makes our earth much older than the Bible does, which is a great mistake ; for if the geologist could prove to a certainty that the earth was a million of years older than Adam it would conflict with no statement in the Bible. How do they set to work to prove that the earth is of any given age? They say the many layers of rock evidently formed under water, some of which are formed of fragments of older rocks, containing shells, bones and bird tracks made when the rocks were soft mud, goes to show great age. But this, and all such as this, utterly fails to give any certain age to our earth.

One writer furnishes us with this duplicate problem : "A certain house was found to be built with ten courses of hewn stone in the basement, forty courses of brick in the first story, thirty-six courses in the second, and thirty in the third ;

with a roof of nine-inch rafters covered with inch boards, and an inch-and-a-half layer of coal tar and gravel. How long was it in building? A student in mathematics who would not laugh at any man who would attempt to solve a problem like this, ought to say, I'll never laugh again. He might ask: How can you tell unless you know where the materials came from, how they were conveyed, how many workmen were employed, and how much each could do in a day? If the brick were made by hand, the lumber all dressed by hand with a hand saw and jack-plane, the materials hauled fifty miles in an ox wagon, the brick carried up by an Irishman in a hod, and the work done by a slow-going jobbing contractor, who could only afford to pay three or four men at a time, they would not get through in a year. But if the building stone and sand were found in excavating the cellar, the brick were made by steam, and came by railroad, a good master-builder, with steam saw and planing mills, steam hoists, and a strong force of workmen, would run it up in three weeks."

So our geologists ought to say, "We don't know either the source of the materials of the earth's strata nor the means by which they were conveyed to their present position, therefore we can't tell the time required for its formation." But instead of saying this they have imagined that blind physical forces worked with the most



unsuitable materials and agencies, and with the most inadequate forces, and therefore it took millions of years to bring it into existence. Some of their number, being disgusted with the problem, have assumed that "the universe is infinite and eternal," seeming to forget that the readings of fossil remains in the rocks prove that the earth has undergone many changes since organic life was introduced upon its surface. Denudations and new constructions characterize its history through ages of the past. The fundamental dogma of atheism is "that the earth is eternal, and therefore self-existent; that the universe is infinite; that it has no boundaries; suns succeeding suns, and firmaments clustering beyond firmaments throughout infinite space."

The utter absurdity of this statement is found in the fact that astronomical observation has demonstrated that there is room in empty space for nineteen million three hundred and ninety-five thousand one hundred and nine such universes as ours. Ours bears no more proportion to infinite space than a fishing boat to the Atlantic ocean. If our universe were infinite the whole heaven would seem to be one vast milky way, exhibiting that whitish light which results from the mingling of the rays of stars and comets; if these were infinitely numerous it would not be possible for an unilluminated spot to be seen in the whole expanse. It is said the tele-

scope has augmented the visible universe one hundred and twenty-five million, and made men feel that our planet is but as a handful of dust upon the sea shore in comparison with the immensity of the creation. The telescope has also shown boundless regions of darkness and solitude stretching around and far away beyond existing planets.

The Bible gives us no theory of creation. It simply asserts that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; but it does not give us the how. Such knowledge could be of no use to us, for He does not propose to employ us in the world-making business. Our knowledge of astronomy has been accumulative, handed down from generation to generation and received by faith. How many unbelievers in Christianity use telescopes, and chemical laboratories, and make geological explorations? Not one man in a thousand verifies the facts of the sciences. By faith one generation stands upon the shoulders of another, and thus we move onward and upward in knowledge, and unbelievers live by faith as well as we.

It has been said, negatives have nothing to do but to deny or object, but this is a great mistake; they are bound by all the laws of logic to prove their objections. A man is regarded, in logical discussion, as defeated when he refuses to sustain his objections. What is unbelief? It is the

negation of the truth when it is used as the opposite of the truth ; then it is like a vessel at sea without a bottom, inside the eddies all suck downward. All who oppose the religion of the Christ have certain affirmative positions, which they ought to maintain by evidence, or abandon them. Instead of doing this they have swung off into the regions of mere hypothesis, or guess-work. That which they do not comprehend they say they do not know. To be consistent they should deny their own existence, for they do not comprehend themselves, yet they do know themselves. Their language is a confusion of speech. Webster defines the term "know" in its first meaning, to perceive with certainty, to understand clearly, to have a clear and certain perception of truth, fact, or anything that actually exists. To know a thing precludes all doubt or uncertainty of its existence. We know what we see *with* our eyes, or perceive with other senses. We know that fire and water are different substances. We know that truth and falsehood express ideas incompatible with each other. We know that a circle is not a square. We do not know the truth of reports, nor can we always know what to believe. Second meaning, to be informed of, to be taught. It is not unusual for us to say we know things from information, when we rely on the veracity of the informer. Third meaning, to dis-

tinguish, as to know one man from another. We know a fixed star from a planet by its twinkling.

Do we comprehend all that we see with our eyes?

Do we comprehend all that we hear with our ears?

Do we comprehend all that we feel?

Do we comprehend all that we smell?

Do we comprehend all that we taste?

These five questions touch our five senses, and yet we must answer every one in the negative. And yet Webster says: We know what our senses enable us to perceive. Where is the difficulty?

Answer—Know and comprehend are very different words.

Webster says: Incomprehensibility is that which is beyond the reach of the human intellect. We know much that is incomprehensible. But how can men intelligently talk about the unknown and unknowable? The unknown is one thing and the incomprehensible is quite another. A student must know a problem before he undertakes to solve it. Knowing it he undertakes its solution, but incomprehensible problems do not admit of solution. Such have been given to students to sharpen them up upon the subject of what is and what is not a mathematical problem. When a teacher gives such a problem he can say the solution is inconceivable, but the student



struggles with it until he discovers the fact that it is not a mathematical problem and throws it to one side. Still he knows the problem, and twelve months afterwards gives it to another student to whet him up.

The incomprehensible is conceivable, is knowable, and the unknowable is neither conceivable or knowable. The men who are so fond of talking about the unknowable, say, "If we have a mind to find the principle of action in matter and the origin of things, it is forever to fall back into difficulties, and to absolutely abridge the examination of our senses, which only can make us know and judge of the causes capable of acting upon them, or impressing on them motion." Their own philosophy is that all our ideas are the result of causes capable of acting upon our senses, or impressing on them motion, and "all such causes, with them, are found in the objects of sense, and that the human mind can not originate a simple idea. If their philosophy be true, the origin of the Christian religion must of necessity belong to minds of another world. According to their philosophy it never could, with its simple ideas belonging to another world, have originated in the human mind. How can they account for the idea of an unseen inheritance in reservation in heaven, or for the idea of one supreme creator, who is the Father of all His children, or for the

idea of pardon, or the idea of everlasting life, when all the currents of nature are downward. According to their teaching, how did man ever come to entertain the knowledge of invisible things pertaining to an unseen world? things beyond the grave and beyond the clouds. The idea of a mythical origin will not do, because a myth is always related, like a counterfeit, to something real that is near or remote. Again, the age of myths was a thousand years after Moses.

Faith is a logical corollary of science, and the most noble flight of human intelligence, a common corollary of common sense, the bond of companionship, without which there is neither happiness nor prosperity. It is the endless chain that holds the knowledge and experience of past generations, enabling each to commence one scale higher than its predecessor, reaching from Adam to the present.

## NATURAL MORALITY, CIVILIZATION AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

Moral nature distinguishes between vice and virtue. There is a spirit in man and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding. *Job, 32:8*. This universal inspiration by the creative act gave us an intellectual and moral nature. We sometimes call it common sense, sometimes reason. Without it we would be like Nebuchadnezzar was when his heart was changed from a man's and a beast's heart was given unto him. Natural morality is the result of a natural endowment, given to man's spirit by the Infinite Creator, in the creative act. It is called by some writers the first degree of reason, to distinguish it from reasoning. We brought it into the world with us. It is by virtue of this that all rational men recognize axioms, or first truths, upon presentation, without asking for proof, and it being common to all rational men, we often call it common sense. Where it is deficient or wanting, neither learning nor religion will supply the deficiency. Common sense is like a torch-light in the darkness, increasing the circumference of vision. A man with little is better off than a man with none, because he can see a little way

around himself and care for himself. Where there is no common sense there is no reason, and where there is no reason there is no responsibility. Moral nature distinguishing between vice and virtue does not belong to physical nature, nor to beasts. A man with an inferior body may have much more common sense than his neighbor with his superior body.

The horse has no moral nature. There is one good reason he does not possess it, and that is, he was made for man's use. If he possessed the intelligence, reason or common sense of man, he would never be submissive to man's will. As it is, he will carry a thief as well as his master. Brute nature, with all of its instinctive and acquired intelligence, is far below man, below moral nature, which we never find until we reach conscience, distinguishing right from wrong, and, like all natural laws, carrying its sanctions with it, its remorse and approbation. Moral nature is identical with the first degree of reason. It is manifested in heathen life. There we find the knowledge of the distinction between the right and the wrong. Conscience has been called the natural law of natural morality, which seems to be proper, because the field of natural morality is limited to natural knowledge which belongs to the common and universal inspiration of the creative act, and is embodied in the wisdom of this world.



Natural morality is advocated by all secularists, or one-world men. It is good as far as it goes, but it is insufficient for the purposes of civilized life. It has mercy for near relatives while they are friends, but for enemies it has none. When conscience gives commands upon an acquired and higher plane of knowledge, it gets beyond kinship and above the natural, which is pagan ground, and largely selfish. It is true secularism, or one-world-ism. Natural morality alone never built a civilization. Morals under varying conditions of humanity are, like plants, modified by the more or less favorable circumstances and conditions of growth, but they could not exist without a fundamental identity with the common sense of mankind. Natural morality is connected with building up civilizations only when it is elevated by education to the plane of equal rights and civil authorities. Where there is only natural morality there is selfishness. It has been called by Calvin Blanchard, in his life of Thomas Paine, all benefiting selfishness, and contrasted, in his way of doing, with, what he is pleased to call, political demagoguery and ballot-box jugglery. You may be very wise in regard to natural laws, foreseeing the results of disobedience to them, and live and die in those forms of paganism which rejected all authorities higher than self, a stranger to civilized life. There is

no civilization without higher authorities than self.

Natural conscience and natural morality, being limited to nature, admit of no interference on the part of civil or religious institutions, for when civil institutions have elevated conscience and natural morality above the simple natural, the morality as well as conscience is no longer simply natural. Natural morality and natural conscience, when they are no more than natural, place us simply on pagan or heathen ground. Mr. Blanchard, an advocate of natural morality, discards all revealed religion and all legislative bodies, whether in one form of government or another, and bases his cause upon selfishness. Natural morality is seen in the simple distinction between right and wrong, which distinction is in the mind of every rational heathen, and this conscience gives. Jude, speaking of these characters, says, "they know nothing only what they know naturally as brute beasts; and in those things," he says, "they corrupt themselves."

Mr. Blanchard, with his natural morality, lands himself in anarchy, and then proceeds to murder his own theory by denouncing the law of natural morality—conscience, saying it is a barricade of hypocrisy. And then, as if it were not enough to remove natural morality from the earth, he says: "Vice and virtue are the most mischievous terms that ever crept into the English vocabulary."

Now, I suggest an axiom : No natural conscience, no natural morality. Where there is no natural conscience there is no natural knowledge. Such men plead for a natural morality and destroy the first truths upon which all morality is built. And this they do in trying to get rid of all that they regard as diseases of civilization and religion, committing suicide in logic. Where there is no moral nature there is no conscience, there is nothing to educate. He who has no moral nature has no common sense, no reason. Common sense, being the first degree of reason and the only natural morality known in intelligent thought, can be educated.

Acquired morality is the result of educating the conscience, or common sense, and this education is an increase of the light of knowledge, enabling us to see away beyond the natural and know more in the field of human action and interests ; more of that which should be done and should not be done. Civilizations are the result of the education of conscience, which is the unit lying at the beginning of every series of progressive steps leading from nature up to nature's God. To stop at and with the natural is to stop with natural self, and this is to discard all education, moral, civil and religious, which is pure anarchy and irreligion.

Why should men of common sense, who advocate progression, stop on the first round of the

ladder? The least degree of civilized life under the higher forms of government is far better than paganism, far better than heathen life. Lift conscience up, by increasing its knowledge, until it is in the enjoyment of both civil and divine life, a life which is no painted counterfeit, such as hypocrites wear, and then there will be a denial of all improper, degrading gratifications of fleshly desires, and a yielding to the leadings of a spiritual nature. Men who have never been thus educated and elevated above natural morality are sure to live after the flesh, because they see no reason why they should live otherwise. Men who are so debased in their minds, even in a civilized country, have nothing but the civil authorities to fear; have nothing in their hearts to keep them from midnight crimes, which may be beyond the reach of the civil authorities. Men without faith in God and future rewards have indulged in all manner of lewdness and debauchery, while all manner of crimes have been prevented by such faith. Control the mind or heart by religious beliefs and you control the fountain or source of all deliberate action.

The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things, and the evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth evil things. Faith, in a Christian sense, purifies the heart by elevating the conscience to God and spiritual things. This elevation lifts the



man above all heathenism, even higher than mere civil life into a divine life.

The sanctions of natural laws are experienced under the natural.

The sanctions of civil laws are experienced under the civil, and the sanctions of religion are experienced under religion. Natural conscience has nature in it and all around it. When it is elevated to civil life it has civil authority in it and all around it, and when it is elevated to a divine life it has God in it and all around it. Thus conditioned we live as seeing him who is invisible, doing all as unto God, and not unto men. But we never came thus to God without faith. The light of natural morality always existed in man's nature, but it was always insufficient until it was coupled with the knowledge of the motives of revealed religion; but it was always the germ, the twig that is bent by education. If it be without education, its light will always be limited to a very narrow circumference, and it will be liable to be misguided, but whether guided aright or misguided, it is always found where rational men are found. All missionary efforts proceed in view of these facts. Conscience is educated in many ways, and is much abused.

A Christian conscience has a spirit in it that secularism—one-world-ism—does not possess. It is not the mere acts performed, but the motives by

which and the spirit in which they are performed, that constitutes Christian morality. To do all as unto God with a sense or spirit of submission to His authority is the greatest work of human life. Thus living you are right in motive, right in spirit, right in action, provided you are doing the things commanded. Worship is reverence and adoration following a spiritual condition, a leaning upon God. Professor Clifford said: "It can not be doubted that belief in God is a comfort and solace to those who hold it, and that the loss of it is a very painful loss. It can not be doubted, at least by many of us in this generation, who either profess it now, or received it in our childhood and have parted from it since with such searching trouble as only cradle faiths can cause. We have seen the spring sun shine out of an empty heaven, to light up a soulless earth. We have felt with utter loneliness that the great companion is dead. Our children, it may be hoped, will know that sorrow only by the light of a wandering compassion. Companionship is the school of character, and God is the Christian's greatest companion. He is working with us for the right. When we are banded with our Father in heaven and his son, Jesus, the Christ, and with all saints, and with the angels in heaven, in trying to bring men from their sinful ways, we are working out the greatest of all the purposes of God. Frederick Harrison said: "If the relig-

ious foundations and the religious sanctions of morality be given up, human life runs the risk of sinking into depravity, since morality without religion is insufficient for general civilization."

In the Christian life all morality is united with God. He is not a secondary figure, but the central sun. In view of the limited character of natural morality and its insufficiency for the purposes of civilization some writers have overlooked it altogether. Lord Selborne says: "Looking at the thing in a general way, morality has not flourished among either civilized or uncivilized men when religious belief has been generally lost or utterly debased. Not to dwell upon the case of savage races, the modern Hindoos and Chinese have long been civilized, but are certainly not moral; nor can anything worse be conceived than the morality of the Greeks and Romans at the height of their civilization." This author is not alone in seemingly overlooking natural morality, or conscience. Dr. Ward says: "The absence of religious belief in a personal God and personal immortality does not simply injure morality, but, if the unbelievers carry out their views consistently, utterly destroys it." Closely connected with the stern self-denial and strength of character so prominently manifested among the first Christians was their moral courage. It requires very little experience and knowledge of men to

enable us to see that a majority of people are moral cowards.

“There is a demoralizing miasma which the school-boy experiences when he is laughed at on account of singularity of dress or appearance. The slavery of fashion among people of mature age is based upon this same miasmatic influence. The fear of standing “so and so” has kept many a public man from expressing an honest conviction, when by being a moral hero, and saying his piece, he might have put a gag upon the mouth of a great wrong. How very different was the atmosphere the Savior breathed! There he stands, in the New Testament, and in the name of God calls upon men to renounce their most cherished sins, and trampled under foot the most loved idols of all the people. And there stands one of his disciples, before an enraged assembly, saying, “If it be lawful in the sight of God, to hearken unto men rather than unto God, judge ye;” in those days such rare manhood was as common among Christians as cowardice is now among the masses of the people. The true Christian is a moral hero, has the spirit of an unflinching martyr, governed by principle at all times and under all circumstances; one who cares all for truth and right, even at the expense of sacrificing self, and therefore is no egotist, vainly puffed up with the pride of self conceit.—*Blackey*.



The Nazarene was a model of heroism ; he stood by the right at the expense of the cross “The moral heroism of his followers immortalized their cause, and conquered the Roman empire, and the Greeks and Romans learned how to be moral heroes from the missionaries of Palestine.”

## GENESIS AND GEOLOGY.

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth ;” this creation is placed in the past tense and followed by the work, of the formative period, of six days. There was a condition of things prior to the first day, which is also put in the past tense, and is expressed in the words : “And the earth was without form and void,” or, as it is in the original, “Empty and unfurnished,” “and darkness was upon the face of the great deep.” This state of things is spoken of in the language of the Lord addressed to *Job*, 38:4 : “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof? When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddlingband for it?”

Here the Lord talks to Job as Genesis talks to us. The earth was clothed with a cloud, and

thick darkness was a swaddlingband for it until the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, and God said: "Let there be light," in the singular. This was as different from the two great lights placed in the heavens as the abstract is from the concrete; as when I say, light travels 195,000 miles per second, which is very different from saying, put out the lights. The original terms, in the third verse of Genesis 1, and the fourteenth verse, are more different. They are as different as light and light-houses. In the third verse God commanded the light to shine out of darkness—*See 2 Cor., 4:6*. It was thick darkness, a swaddlingband for the earth; this, with the cloud which clothed it, was temporary, limited to a certain period of time. The two great lights to rule the day and the night were located in the heavens, but the light of Genesis 1:3, was located in the thick darkness. The light of the sun never reached our earth until its garment of cloud and thick darkness, or swaddlingband, gave way for its appearance, and this change of its condition took place when the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, and broke up the swaddlingband.

Genesis 1 speaks of the earth alone as needing to be illuminated. No verse, in the first chapter of Genesis and the first verse, speaks of the creation of the lights of heaven. These may have been illuminating other planets for ages be-

fore earth's swaddlingband was removed so as to let the sunlight in. God, who continues drawing light out of the dark thunder-cloud, in the night, commanded the light to shine out of darkness. The first chapter of Genesis does not assert that the heavens and the earth were created in six days, but in the beginning. The work of the six days is not expressed in the original by the word *created*, but by another word. The words *create* and *make* are very different words, which present us with a contrast between the work of creation and formation. Creation was a work of the beginning, formation was the work of the six days. The original terms are *bra* and *oshe*. The beginning was before the first day, how long before no man can tell, because we are neither informed by the Bible nor science. Science and the Bible are in perfect harmony upon this question. Geologists may fathom the depths of the earth, and astronomers may scan the heavens with their telescopes, and we will place all the truths and facts they discover in our Master's crown. We never shall be able to locate the beginning, for it is placed in antiquity beyond our ability to calculate. As a scriptural fact it simply introduces us to the Heavenly Father as the creator of all things, and to the Christ as the one through whom, or by whom, all things were created.

Geologists themselves borrowed this Bible



phrase "In the beginning," to designate those stratas of the earth which they call the primary, or first formations. The phrase in the Bible marks the last point on the ocean of an eternity that is past. It is the only positive phrase by which we can express the most remote period of past duration. It is not a date nor point in time, but a period, an immense cycle. It has but one boundary, and that is where the visible universe rises out of the invisible. It carries us back beyond the era of human existence to indefinite ages, to the times when all things were created by the Christ, and leaves us there with Him. He was before all things.—See *Col.*, 1:16. In the eighth chapter of Proverbs wisdom is personified in these words: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, then I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: While as yet He had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world." When? Answer, "In the beginning of His way." "Before His works of old."

In Micah 5:2, it is said: "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come

forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel ; whose goings-forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” In the second chapter of Matthew and the sixth verse this language is applied to the Christ, and credited to this prophet. I am often amused with the manner in which some men assail the first chapter of Genesis. In the Jewish talmud we are told that a prince said to Rabbi Gamaliel: “Your God is a thief, he surprised Adam in his sleep, and stole a rib from him. The rabbi’s daughter overheard the speech and stepping forward, feigning terror and dismay, she cried out: “My Liege! My Liege! Justice! Revenge!” “What has happened?” asked the prince. She replied: “A robber crept secretly into our house, carried away a silver goblet and left a gold one in its place.” “What an upright thief,” exclaimed the prince. “Would that such robberies were more frequent.” The lady said: “Then, sir, that is the kind of thief our Creator was, for he stole a rib from Adam, and gave him a beautiful wife in its place.”

“Well said!” said the prince. In referring to the law of Moses men are committing the same foolish blunder, for law is as necessary to humanity’s welfare as Adam’s wife was to his. Laws penal as well as civil are necessary to a civilization. The ancient law was a great blessing to Abraham’s family. It existed with a people, and in an age when sins required heroic treatment ;

and while its penalties made sin appear exceeding sinful, by putting sinners out of the way, it left a grand civilization in their place. Men were not obliged to disobey the law. There has been no time, from Adam till now, when all men could be governed without law. During all the centuries there have been those who were lawless, who disregarded law ; could not be governed with law in a respectable manner. As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses so do lawless men resist the law. And still the lawless would be more numerous if there was no fear of its penalties.

L. of C.

## SOURCES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE.

There is an internal source of knowledge as well as an external. Our senses connect us with the outside world, but this would be of no consequence to us without the conscious intelligence dwelling within. External objects set us to thinking. But to conclude, for this reason, that the intellect or mind is not a source of knowledge is absurd ; it is to acknowledge an objective without a subjective, and this is the most rank materialism. If it be right to strike out of existence the inner mind, the higher nature of man, then it remains necessarily true that all our ideas are immediate effects resulting from external objects acting upon our senses. In this case the same object of sense should always produce the same ideas, not only in the same man, but in every man. Two hundred men, looking on the same object, should be impressed just alike, and experience the same thoughts ; otherwise the same cause will not produce the same effects, which would certainly be the case if all things were equal ; but they are not, and the inequality belongs to the subjective—the inner mind, and this inequality causes a great variety of thoughts in a score of men looking at the same object, be-



cause they differ in their mental conditions. It is possible that no two of them will be impressed alike. Their different minds give rise to a diversity of ideas, and this can never be accounted for upon the hypothesis that there is but one source of knowledge, and that the objective. We are logically driven to find another source, and by adding this to the external we have a two-fold fountain, and from the different mental conditions we may account for diversity of emotions and thoughts.

The internal source of knowledge is the mind itself in action. The thinker dwells within, and external objects may set us to thinking, or, in many a given case, may not. Voltaire put it thus, "I do not get my thoughts from external surroundings, for they have none to give." Yet we say the external world is a source of knowledge, because being connected with it by our senses we are excited to think, or to mental activity. The immediate cause of every thought is within, the remote or stimulating cause is often without. The mind lies at the root of all knowledge. It can not be the brain, for all brains are alike, with the exception that they may be small or large. They are alike in their physical qualities. Unbelievers in the Christian religion generally adopt the physical-force theory of thought, the materialistic idea, that all our ideas are pictures on the brain, made by external objects of sense. And

why do they? The answer is this: It is easy to banish religion when you have robbed yourself of all that makes religion of any value to you, in the ages to come. If a man is all animal he will die like an animal, and death will end all. If our personality and individuality is to be predicated upon animal nature, then the distinction between person and thing is broken down, and all is lost in death.

First truths, or axioms, need only to be presented to any man of intelligence and his immediate consent is given. Reasoning from axioms is called demonstrative reasoning, because a legitimate conclusion from an axiom enters consciousness as knowledge. Reasoning from first truths and axioms is demonstrative. All other reasoning is called speculative reasoning. The law that life only produces life, and the axiom that involution lies behind evolution; and that you can get no more out of a thing than there is in it, are a trinity of axiomatic first truths compelling us to relegate life and intelligence to the spiritual nature of man, and this spiritual nature to that eternal living spirit who gave it, and He, God, is our ultimate in our inductive Christian philosophy.

Life, being involved in the spiritual nature of man, is of the genus of an imperishable nature. We can put no cut-off behind us, and certainly none ahead of us, for imperishable nature can

not die. Carpenter, in his large work upon physiology, eighth edition, by Francis Smith, p. 56, says: "The soul, it has been remarked, is that side of our nature which is in relation with the infinite, and it is the existence of this relation, in whatever way we may describe it, which seems to constitute one of the most distinctive peculiarities of man." By this imperishable spirit, often called the soul by modern writers, man is connected with the higher order of beings in which intelligence exists untrammelled by the corporeal mechanism through which it here operates.

Huxley says: "I understand and respect the meaning of the word 'soul,' as used by pagan and Christian philosophers, for what they believe to be the imperishable seat of human personality, bearing throughout eternity its burden of woe, or its capacity for adoration and love." I confess that my dull moral sense does not enable me to see anything base or selfish in the desire for a future life among the spirits of the just made perfect, or even among a few such poor fallible souls as one has known here below."—*Modern Symposium*, p. 82. Then on page 250 he gives us these words: "In like manner it seems to me impossible to overestimate the influence of speculative beliefs, as to the nature of the Deity, apart from all idea of rewards and punishments upon personal morality. The lover of moral beauty, struggling through a world full of sorrow and

sin, is surely as much stronger for believing that sooner or later a vision of perfect peace and goodness will burst upon him, as the toiler up a mountain for the belief that beyond crag and snow lie home and rest."

"When unbelief in a future state of being triumphs in the human heart, it gives the lie to scientific first truths, crowns the tyrant Death forever on his throne, and seals the victories of the grave over the whole human family; wraps the tomb in eternal darkness; suffers not one of the great and good of all the ages to see the light of immortality." It identifies the noblest of all earth's sons with the lowest and meanest of all insects. It robs man of every noble estimate of himself, murders all his hopes of future welfare, and throws him out upon the ocean of life, to drift with the winds and tides until, in some unexpected moment, he is sucked down in the whirlpool of annihilation.

What do they give us for all they have taken away? Nothing but the mists of darkness or ignorance, with the prospect of the blackness of eternal darkness in the great future. They say, "reason is left." Left where? Left in the grave? Oh, they mean to say, reason is our standard of truth and right. Whose reason? Well, from their standpoint it is called natural morality—morality without belief in God and future rewards, pagan reason. Yes! Their materialistic



philosophy reduces us in this life to paganism and death to dust, or the transmigration theory of existence in some animal or bird, or to a wandering table-rapping spirit in the midst of lying spirits as well as others, both in and out of the flesh! And this based upon assumed revelations from the world of all kinds of spirits. There is no such thing as a standard of right and wrong in pagan common sense, for here there is no harmony outside of a very limited sense of right and wrong; nothing here but the twig, or natural capacity for education. All men have not the same amount of common sense, nor the same degree of natural capacity, even for education. Reason is left? It just amounts to this, every man is his own standard, and standards will differ as men differ. Some men have very little common sense, and some have a great deal more.

All men are not trained alike in reasoning, nor in thinking. There is no common standard here outside of axioms and intuitive truths, and these are only a foundation for education, and the structures reared upon these differ as widely as men in science and religion differ. The greatest amount of reasoning is of the speculative kind, having nothing to do with axioms and first truths, but are air castles built upon hypotheses. Voltaire said: "My reason alone, referring to reasoning from axioms and first truths, teaches me that there is a God who is a Creator of all

things.” Another man’s little reason, or common sense, or speculative reasoning, allows him to say, in his heart, there is no God. If I am to be governed by my reason alone, and you are to be governed by yours, and so on to the last man, then every man is to be his own governor, and universal selfishness will be the rule of life. So here we are as we always have been, and improvement is not to be expected.

One man’s reason guides him into bankruptcy, another man’s reason guides him, in his efforts to accumulate wealth, into the penitentiary, and another man’s reason leads him into Mormonism, and another is led into Calvinism. What a wonderful millennium this reason alone would bring about! Secularists dream of a secular heaven, or paradise somewhat after the style of a school of freethinkers, where they can live in a colony as independent as bumble bees. Their hopes are high, are they not? They say: “One world at a time.” Their heaven is of short duration, the grave wipes it out. The ancient unbeliever’s motto is appropriate just here: “Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die.”

The Christian’s faith takes him beyond the grave; in thought it leads him across the gulf between the living and the dead, and unites him by a glorious hope with the imperishable, sets him down with his Lord. His motto is, “For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.” His stand-

ards are first truths and axioms in science, and the word of God in religion. The Christian's standards are unchangeable, everywhere the same. Secularists see the pillars upon which our bridge across the gulf between life and death rests, for they have given to them a name, viz., the "unknown." But it is a little strange that they should profess to know enough about the "unknown" to know that the Christian's religion and scientific axioms are both false. Their "unknown" consists in first causes "with which they say they have nothing to do." Yet they are all the while trying to show that the Christian is wrong about first causes; these being their unknown, how are they to tell who is right or wrong about them? What do they know about the unknown? Do they mean what they say? If they do their ignorance is profound. They have never yet crossed the gulf lying between the organic kingdoms of life and the mineral kingdom of universal death. According to their own showing their boat remains chained to the shore. They tried the imaginary bridge of spontaneous generation of life from dead atoms, and found nothing but quicksand to rest its pillars upon; then they abandoned the enterprise.

In logic and scientific investigation upon this subject they have sunk in the "gulf of gulfs," sunk in their professed ignorance, trying to repudiate that which they profess to know nothing



about. How long will it take them to rise? And what have they gained for themselves or anybody else by adopting the name, the “unknown, or unknowable”? Voltaire, in correspondence with one of these very wise fellows, said: “We are all swimming in a sea of which we have never seen the shore. Woe be to those who fight while they swim: Land who can, but he that cries out to me, ‘You swim in vain, there is no land,’ disheartens me, and deprives me of all my strength. What is the object of our dispute? To console our unhappy existence? Who consoles it most, you or I? You yourself own in some passages of your work that belief in a God has withheld some men on the brink of crime. For me this acknowledgment is enough. If this has prevented but ten assassinations, but ten calamities, but ten calumnies, but ten iniquitous judgments, on the earth, I hold that the whole earth ought to embrace it.”—*Philosophic Dic.*, p. 385. The most beautiful, soul-inspiring harmonies that I ever contemplated are those of science and revealed religion. The vital spirit in the physical system is neither a physical nor chemical force, because it is the opposite of both in its struggle for existence in the body. They disintegrate, and it builds up; it is the wonderful organization builder. As a power, or force, it is separate from the forces of the non-living world. The body without the spirit is dead, being alone.



No spirit of life, no organism, is as worthy of being set down as an axiom, as any other axiom. It is but another way of saying, No builder, no building.

Lionel Beal says: "It is difficult to conceive how any one, who has thought over the facts which are well known to every working student in physiology, could have succeeded in so misleading himself and others as even to hint that the formation of tissue of any kind could be explained by physics and chemistry." He then adds, "There is not the shadow of argument founded upon fact, or upon the results of observation, to give countenance to such a doctrine. The idea that the first molecules of an organism arranged themselves, that the forces were the forces of the non-living substance, were inherent in the non-living, and that these so arranged the molecules that tissue resulted, is supported by no argument whatever, neither is it supported by any evidence whatever." Yet these ideas must be true upon any other than Christian grounds. The spirit of man is the spirit of life from God. It is his genus. He is a spirit. The inorganic or mineral kingdom without God would have remained forever under the reign of universal death. Not one particle of matter in the mineral kingdom ever took on life without coming in contact with life.

All science, pertaining to life, demonstrates the

fact that all life is from the invisible, is inherent in the invisible, and that all organisms proceed from life. We accept this as a simple incomprehensible fact of the nature of a first truth. Paul said upon the hill of Mars: "God giveth to all life and breath." Life first. Adam lived before he breathed, for dead lungs do not breathe. The same is true as an order in the kingdom of nature. Spiritual nature ever was, and is, and forever will be, the medium of connection between God and the mineral kingdom. It is the living link between the living God and the living world. Paul said: "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal power and divinity. Here science and religion are in wedlock. We regret that there are those in our country who say God is unknown to them, and yet have intelligence enough to know an axiom, or first truth. The existence of God is a legitimate conclusion arising out of axioms. A man is just as rational when he denies an axiom as when he denies a legitimate conclusion drawn from an axiom. And the man who does either is guilty of an irrational act. There is no life without antecedent life, never was, and never will be.

## CONCEPTION AND JUDGMENT.

Men conceive thousands of things about which they have no faith at all. Such as a mountain of gold or a horse with wings. So conception does not necessarily carry faith along with it, but belief carries conception, for he that believes must have some conception lying behind his belief, a conception of that which he believes. We can not have the belief of any object without a conception of the object. We can not remember things of which we have no conception, and we can not reason about things of which we have no conception. Before we exert our mental powers we must have some conception of that which we will to do. A conception of some object always goes before desire, aversion, love and hatred. We must have conception of the object. In every mental action, in every thought, there must be conception ; this is always at the bottom. Conception is unlike judgment in this respect, that it neither affirms nor denies, while every judgment affirms or denies the truthfulness of a proposition, or of propositions. In conception there is no judgment, belief, or opinion included. In com-

mon speech we say a conception is true or false. When we speak thus we mean by conception opinion. Every opinion is either true or false, but a simple conception expresses no opinion, no judgment. It is defined by Webster, apprehension of anything by the mind. The act of conceiving in the mind that mental act, or combination of acts, by which an idea or notion is formed of an absent object of perception, or of a sensation formerly felt.

When we see an object with our eyes open we have a perception of it. When the same object is presented to the mind with the eyes shut, in idea only, or in memory, we have a conception of it.

Conception may be sometimes used for the power of conceiving ideas, as when we say, a thing is not within our conception. Some writers have defined conception as a distinct faculty of the mind, but it is considered by others as memory, and possibly with propriety. It also signifies purpose conceived, or conception of an act to be performed, view or opinion, apprehension, knowledge, conceit, affected sentiment or thought. All the words by which we designate a simple conception are used to designate opinions. But in all such cases there is some judgment implied in what we call a conception. Conception and judgment are often very closely related. Conception always going before and essential to judgment. No conception, no judgment ; but the rule



does not admit of the reverse, that is to say, there may be conception and no judgment following. Simple or bare conception is what logicians call apprehension, and implies neither opinion nor judgment.

A conception is that which is conceived in the mind. It is said that it is one thing to conceive and another to execute. A man may think for a long time what he is to do, and after all do nothing. Conceiving as well as resolving are what the schoolmen have called imminent acts of the mind, which necessarily produce nothing beyond themselves. The first kind of conceptions are called fancy pictures, or creatures of the imagination. They are not the copies of any original that exists, but are originals themselves. Examples, Swift's conception of the Island of Laputa, and the country of the Lilliputians, and Cervantes, of Don Quixote. We can conceive of such things distinctly, though they never had any existence. We do not, in our conception of them, ascribe the qualities of true or false to them, because they are not accompanied with any affirmation or negation as touching those qualities. The first kind of conceptions are creatures of the imagination, accompanied with no belief whatever.

There are other conceptions which we call copies, because they have an original or arche-

type to which they refer, and with which they are believed to agree; and we call them true or false as they agree or disagree with the standards to which they are referred. And these are of two kinds. First, pictures taken from life. We have conceptions of certain things really existing, such as the city of New York, or the government of Great Britain. These are originals and our conceptions of them are true or false as they agree or disagree with the originals.

Second, things which really exist, which are God's creatures, the whole nature of which He only knows. We know them in part, and for this very reason our conceptions of them are in all cases imperfect and inadequate, but may be true as far as they reach.

The third kind of conceptions are of species of things, such as man or elephant, and species of qualities, such as wisdom, or courage, or equality, or similitude.

Things are classified by men into kinds or sorts according to their agreement in attributes, and have a general name given to them, signifying only the attributes common to each individual in the class. That such names may answer their purpose it is only necessary that all who use them should have the same conception of them, because the common meaning of these names is the standard by which our conceptions are formed, and they are true or false as they agree

or disagree with this standard. My conception of murder in the first degree is true or false as it agrees or disagrees with the meaning of the terms as settled in the laws of my country.

General conceptions are called universals, and are always designated by general terms. All terms are general except proper names. General terms are the signs of general conceptions, and the standard of these is the use that other men make of the same general words or terms, so we who speak the English language may, with a perfect understanding of our language, agree in our knowledge of things as well as in our faith, provided we avoid mere hypothesis in both science and religion, and in such a case all verbal disputes should terminate. But it is impossible for a man to express himself with clearness and so as to be distinctly understood where his knowledge of the meaning of words and his conceptions both are at fault. Indistinct conceptions are the cause of many errors in judgment, and an improper use of words is another source of error. Men who conceive things in the same manner are of the same judgment. Is it possible for men to disagree touching the conclusion of a syllogism when they have the same conceptions of the premises? A man can not be convinced by what he can not, or does not, understand. It is a matter of first importance to make yourselves understood. Every man has not the

same ability to do this. Nature has placed us here, and our natural ability and training has made a great difference between man and man, yet we may have clear conceptions to a very considerable degree, and distinct apprehensions of things which we speak and reason about, and therefore should always try to make ourselves understood.

In our manhood our most simple conceptions are not those which nature presents to us, because we have ability to analyze objects of nature, and conceive their attributes one by one and to give a name to each which extends in its meaning to the single attribute. And this single attribute is our simplest conception. When we analyze body we form to ourselves the conceptions of extension, solidity, space, a point, a line, a surface, all of more simple character than itself. Our conception of body is made up of these simple elements just as our conception of matter is made up of its properties, and as our conception of mind is made up of its qualities or attributes. Imagination is such that we may take the simple ingredients, or attributes, or properties, and may pick and choose, and arrange until we have an endless variety, almost, of combinations, complex things which are only things of the imagination clearly conceived, though never in existence outside of thought, perceived only in mental vision. Here you dis-



cover that I use perception where it is only mental vision interchangeably with conception. And in all such cases these are to be distinguished from every other faculty of the mind. It is also worthy of remark that the Cartesian philosophy treats conception and perception as one and the same faculty. The other faculties are concerned about realities only, while mental perception and conception are often concerned about things which never had an existence. The unlearned, guided by their common sense, believe that the real objects of sense which they perceive certainly exist, but they also know that they can see in mental vision or imagination a thousand things that never existed, and that the bare conception of a thing is not even a presumption of its existence.

Strictly speaking in abstraction, I perceive nothing that is difficult to be understood, or put into practice. What is more easy than distinguishing the different attributes belonging to a subject? In the case of man, his size, complexion, age, fortune, birth, profession and many other things that are his. To speak of these things, and reason about them with clearness, is abstraction, and this is easy work. There may be distinctions demanding close attention and an acquaintance with the subject that is not usual, or common. A lawyer ought to excel in distinctions in crimes, and contracts, and actions

in courts, and a doctor ought to excel in distinctions in diseases and medicines. A man who does not in abstract reasonings will make many mistakes, and is liable to make a failure in any profession, and more especially in the practice of medicine, because here there is a constant and continual demand upon his powers of abstraction. The symptoms of a disease may be easily distinguished and disjoined in our conception, and at the same time can not be separated in the subject. I can separate, in thought, solidity from extension, and both these from weight. In extension I can separate length from breadth, and both these from thickness, but none of these attributes can be separated from body. Then we must always remember that there may be attributes belonging to a subject, or disease of which we have no knowledge, but this does not interfere with conceiving those attributes or symptoms which we may know.

Abstraction contrasts with generalization, which is the observance of one or more attributes or symptoms common to many subjects or diseases. So you discover that the doctor who is a good physician is the one who is good in abstraction and in generalization, for their entire practice lies inside of these mental processes. It is well to remark that both these are commonly included under the name of abstraction.

The ability to reason is one of the prerogatives of inferior intelligences. We can conceive of a superior unlimited understanding to which all truth appears intuitively. We do not ascribe reasoning to the Infinite mind, because it implies a limitation of the understanding. Among men, to use reasoning in self-evident things is like a man walking upon crutches with a good pair of legs.

Reasoning upon many subjects strengthens the faculty and furnishes the mind with a capital stock for future use. Every line of reasoning with which we grow familiar is a highway to many other lines. And then the man who has reasoned most possesses an advantage over others who have reasoned less. Every calling, profession, or rank in life has a mode of thinking, and of reflection proper to itself. The bulk of men of the same rank and occupation are cast into the same mental mold, and the mold itself changes with new inventions, with intercourse with strangers, slowly and gradually. Every condition in civil society demands many trains of thought to be acquired, and made so familiar as to be present with the mind when needed. And for this reason man has a longer infancy and youth than creatures governed by instinct. Even our imagination serves us best in things in which it has been exercised most. Out of this fact grew that old saying, "Every man to his trade." Our

judgments are of two kinds: First, of things necessary. Second, of things contingent, or conditional. In the first—judgment is always easy, because it accompanies all first truths and axioms. This we call pure judgment.

The second kind rests upon testimony which is grounded upon sense, by which we mean that a man judges of colors by his eyes and of sounds by his ears. The proposition that things are as our senses report them to us is conceded in all courts throughout the civilized world. So the evidence upon which we rest our judgments of the second kind is called “the evidence of sense.” When we say we saw so and so we do not add we judge it to be true, because it would be superfluous language. For the same reason we do not say of any self-evident thing, we judge it to be true. This is, nevertheless, a common error in speech, which we often hear. “I saw it,” is enough without adding, “with my eyes.” There are mental operations which carry judgment in them. Speaking of such operations we do not express judgment, because it would be superfluous. Judgment is every determination of the mind concerning what is true or false. In a matter of common sense it has been said, every man is no less a competent judge than a mathematician is in a mathematical demonstration. To suppose a general deviation from truth among



men in things self-evident, for which no cause can be assigned, is unreasonable. There is nothing more natural than for us to trust our reasoning and judging powers, and nothing more unnatural than for us to believe them to be fallacious, and if we are the greatest skeptics we can't maintain such a belief for any great length of time. A man may walk upon his hands, but he will soon get upon his legs. A person of sense is a person of judgment. Good sense is good judgment; nonsense is the opposite of correct judgment.

Our mental faculties fit us for the discovery of truth. They were not given to us to use in such a manner as to corrupt the mind with error. Wrong judgments are the result of a wrong use of our mental powers. The love of truth is natural to man, and strong in every healthy, well disposed mind. But it is overborne by party zeal, by vanity, by the love of money, by the love of victory and by mental laziness. In a healthy state it requires the exercise of all its powers, industry, fortitude, self-denial, candor, frankness, openness to conviction.

There are plenty of men in the world who are so mean and abject that they prefer to live upon the charity of others. And there is a larger class who are mere beggars in regard to knowledge, who know nothing except that "which they know

as natural brute beasts"—experience is their only school. They never dig for truth nor for knowledge, and they are too lazy to think for themselves or for others. Their understanding is, like their clothes, cut according to the fashion.

In all matters of interest every man should be governed by his own final judgment, otherwise he does not act rationally.

If a man claims infallibility in any department of interest to us; we should determine his claims to such a pretense. If a man claims to be an ambassador from heaven we should examine his credentials. A mind full of prejudice is a diseased mind. Such men do not investigate, but they are continually "measuring themselves by themselves and comparing themselves among themselves. They are not wise."

Such diseased minds never advance any science or interest depending upon new discoveries. They are fossils, not reformers. They are parasites, living upon that which other men produce. A true man will study every subject without any idols governing him, without bias or prejudice. The understanding in its healthy state pays its homage to truth only. In diseased minds errors receive the homage that is due to truth. There are abnormal conditions of both body and mind which should be considered and avoided, but there are fatal cases in both depart-

ments. The law governing in the department where I labor says, Let him that will be ignorant be ignorant still. In the doctors' department all you can do in fatal cases is to let them die, because you can do no more, neither can I. "Cast not your pearls before swine lest they trample them under foot and turn and rend you."

## HYPOTHESES OR FACTS, WHICH?

Webster says hypothesis is a supposition ; a thing taken for granted in order to draw a conclusion, or inference, for proof of the point in question, an assumption for the sake of argument ; a system or theory imagined or assumed to account for what is not understood. Sir Isaac Newton's fame was the result of his being taught by Lord Bacon to despise hypotheses as the fictions of human fancy. He laid it down as a rule in searching into the reason of things, that no cause of natural things ought to be assigned but such as can be proven to exist. With this rule before him he proceeded to find out the laws by which phenomena were produced, such as heat and cold. It has been said that the building of hypotheses is an endless labor. Suppositions and hypotheses are the same. The peripatetics supposed sensible species to be sent forth by the objects of sense. Malebranche, born at Paris in 1638, supposed that we perceive the ideas of the Divine mind. Leibnitz, born at Leipsic in Germany in 1644, supposed monads and a pre-established harmony ; and the monads, being of his



own creation, received from him the properties and powers which he chose to give them. The moderns have supposed images created upon the brain.

This hypothetical reasoning reminds me of the Indian who supposed that the earth was supported by a huge elephant standing upon the back of a great tortoise. It has been said that men only begin to have a true taste of philosophy when they have learned to hold hypotheses in contempt; and to consider them as the reveries of speculative minds. It has somehow come to pass that we have common sense, which enables us to know something at least about things by what we can discover, and by what our consciousness and reflection informs us concerning the operations of our own minds. All that we can deduce from common self-evident instructions is true and legitimate in philosophy. A hypothesis which contradicts first truths may be, and is, distinguished from other errors by its being both false and absurd. The term absurd being especially appropriated to errors that offend common sense. For our defense against such, nature has armed us with wit and ridicule. Hypothetical theories generally die away as soon as they lose their novelty, and especially when they are an insult to the common sense of mankind.

The greatest support that the physical force theory of creation and of thought receives at this

time is from men whose philosophy rests upon mere hypothesis, guess-work, suppositions that are in conflict with first truths and axioms. And a vast majority of its supporters are the irreligious of our country. Dr. Darwin's theory of the evolution of the higher species from the lower is as much opposed to facts as the Indian's supposition, and as great an insult to common sense.

On the simple fact of memory there are no less than five assumptions taken for granted in order to maintain the idea of images upon the brain by the perception of external objects. First, the image made upon the brain remains after the object is removed, is permanent on the brain, but not on the organs of sense. Second, while the image remains on the brain the effect, memory, ceases. That is to say, we forget, and have need of recollection.

It is a great absurdity to talk of memory and recollection as the effects of a picture upon the brain, and of the picture being permanent while the effect of memory ceases. And we are curious to know just how it is, that, when the permanent picture has lost the effect, memory, it can produce recollection without memory. Can a man have recollection without memory? If it is really necessary that images should be made upon the brain in order that we may *have* memory, and having memory may have knowledge, why should our knowledge vanish, seeing we have the cause

of memory, the picture, permanently fixed upon the brain? Here is a logical contradiction; that is to say, when the image is on the brain it produces the effect—memory, and when it is on the brain it does not produce the effect—memory. This is a contradiction of the axiom, that a thing can not be and be at the same time. . Does the cause exist without its effect? The theory says yes! Does the cause produce its effect? The theory says yes. Then how is it that the cause is permanent and its effect is not?

The third assumption is, that the same cause which at first produced the image, in recollection produces memory, an operation entirely different from sensation and perception. If conception and sensation produce memory, in recollection, what need is there of images upon the brain to produce memory?

The fourth assumption is, that the image does not produce its effect, memory, at all times.

The fifth assumption is, that the brain stored with images creates images of things having no existence at all. In this case I want to ask how it is that an object having no existence at all made its impression upon the sensorial organs and through them upon the brain? Here the whole theory breaks down. It would be a great saving of mental labor, as well as physical, and much better, for us to turn all this guess-work



out of our literature, relegating it to its proper place—the fictitious scenes of fancy pictures drawn by the air-castle builders of our country, and be content with the ultimate of mental philosophy, viz., mind, or consciousness, as the great trunk, with its simple, incomprehensible and ultimate branches, memory, recollection, reflection and imagination.

We have just as good reasons for resting our case in psychology with mind as any man has for resting his thoughts upon gravity with the word gravitation, and this we have all learned to do. Why not rest our thoughts in mental science upon mind with its powers? In this science men have been building air castles for a thousand years, piling hypothesis upon hypothesis, and have never gotten away from mind, nor destroyed its contrast with matter, nor with any part of physical nature, nor accounted for any one of its faculties by physical laws, and they will not succeed any better in a thousand years more. Men have supposed that external objects act upon the mind in perception, but the object perceived does not act upon the mind nor the mind upon it. The conception of a similitude between mind and body is the source of this error, it is the result of trying to transfer our mental operations to physical forces. Thought in the mind is conceived to be like motion in a body, and as a body



is put in motion, men readily think that mind is the recipient of some impulse from the object seen. I am in this room, and I am able to think of its walls as much as I like, but I should exceedingly regret to find them acting upon me, and I am sure that I shall not act upon them, for I and the owner might get into trouble. Reasonings drawn from such analogies should never mislead us. Because bodies have the property of extension, and can be measured by feet and inches, we should never conclude that mind has the same properties, or that it may be thus measured. Why should we say that mind acts upon bodies by perceiving them, or that bodies act upon mind?

There is in the nature of things no need of any such language. Why should we adopt it and cram psychology with physics? To say that I act upon a horse by looking at him is an abuse of language, because to perceive an object is one thing, and to act upon it is quite another; to think about it is one thing and to act upon it is another. In all such cases the mind's action is in itself, and the effects of its action are in itself. This old materialistic assumption as our only source of knowledge strikes down our manhood. It is the atheistic psychology, in harmony with the idea that we are only thinking machines, governed by external surroundings, or environ-

ments, creatures of circumstances only. Its inner subjective is simply the pictures of the objective on the brain. A secular world of images on the brain? So they say: "One world at a time." Their entire system of thought begins and ends in hypotheses. Guessing is an endless labor, it never finds rest.

In all our schools we need men like Lord Bacon. It is enough to graduate in realities, facts and first truths. There should be no guessing, unless it be for pastime, and then it should be outside of school studies and school hours. There should be no speculation incorporated in any science, because it is not scientific. Science has been defined, certain knowledge, and a mere hypothesis is not certain knowledge. We should be satisfied with the ultimates in all departments, because we can go no farther. The man who tries to get beyond an ultimate is like a man upon the highest mountain peak exerting himself to get higher.

When we reach an incomprehensible we should never try to explain it, because we can not. If we could it would not be an incomprehensible. Neither should we try to simplify a simple, nor spiritualize a spiritual. Conception, perception, memory, imagination, recollection and reflection are all simple powers, faculties of the mind admitting of no explanation, nor simplification; requiring none. The science of psychology rests

upon the unchangeable attributes of spiritual nature, and mind itself, to which these belong, is incomprehensible. Do you say these attributes are unknowable? That is the wrong word; they are incomprehensible, but not unknowable. We have conscious knowledge of these and many other incomprehensible things. Who comprehends electricity, or gravitation, or mind? No man comprehends his own mental nature. We live in a mystery and of it form a part. We should rest our cases always in our ultimates, in what we know. If we go beyond this we are in the field of speculation among the air castle-builders of our country.

I know that Mr. Huxley speaks of our religion as a religion of speculative beliefs, and the only excuse for his doing so is the fact that theologians, like scientists, have gone beyond facts, beyond Bible truth, and revelled in the fields of speculation. In our religion we have facts and first truths as well attested as the facts and first truths of the sciences. Here we should rest our religion. We know there is an eternal ever-living Intelligence. We know this by axiomatic evidences, for conclusions legitimately drawn from axioms always enter consciousness as knowledge. The law of biogenesis, that life only produces life, leaves us with the fact of the existence of an eternal life, that ever was and forever will be. And there is that old axiom that you

can get no more out of a thing than there is in it which drives us to the same conclusion, and is equal to the saying: "Involution lies behind evolution." And these first truths underlie our religion as well as our sciences. There never was, nor ever will be, an endless chain of dependent things, because there must be that which lies behind the first dependent link upon which it depended. And in that was involved all that was evolved. There is no guess work here, but demonstrative reasoning. We know that mind exists with all its faculties. We know that free will exists, and we know that sin is the transgression of law, and that men are sinners, and need to be reformed and saved from sin, and we know that he is righteous who does right. All these things we know. We also know that the power which gave life to dead matter, and has been changing dead matter into living organic nature through all the ages of organic existence, can give life to dead matter again. These truths, and the word of God, are our ultimates in our religion. There is no sense, nor science, nor religion, in a whirlpool of guess work. The end of induction is first truths called ultimates, and the end of deduction is the circumference of all rational intelligence in both science and religion.

First truths, intuitive truths, are always expressed with verbs in the present tense, which are equal to the past, the present and the future,



as when I say five is the half of ten ; that is, it was, is and forever will be. Upon such truths science can have a permanent basis. Christianity has the same kind of a foundation, Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. And the unchangeable "I am," always was, is, and forever will be. Upon such truths only both science and religion can have a permanent foundation. A thing that was and is not will not answer the purpose ; neither will a thing that was, and is, and will not be ; because a science built upon such a foundation is like a house built upon the sand of the seashore, liable to be washed away at any time, and certainly will be. It is axiomatic that the building can't stand when the foundation is gone. How will mere hypothesis do for a foundation?

There is nothing in Darwinism but that which is built upon hypothesis, the guess that man, a being with rational nature, and a free will, with head, arms and legs, was evolved from a headless, boneless, limbless ascidian—a submarine creature giving little evidence of sensation. If man ever was in an ascidian then he was and was not at the same time, unless our definition of manhood was always wrong, and the distinction between person and thing a fiction. I suggest that person never was involved in thing, and therefore never was evolved out of thing, unless a man can be where he is not. How much of this theory lies

outside of the possibility of verification? It is unverified and unverifiable. It is mere assumption hung upon the assumed possibilities of millions of ages, upon ifs, and ifs, and ifs.

Spencer says: "Evolution is a change from an indefinite homogeneity into a definite coherent heterogeneity through continuous differentiations and integrations." Dr. Gregory cites the following version of it, as given by some English critic: "Evolution is a change from a nohowish untalkaboutableness, all likeness, to a somehowish and in general talkaboutable not-at-all likeness, by a continuous somethingelsefications and sticktogetherations." And this is the science which explains everything.

They tell us we may find the missing link between man and the brute in Africa, but the gulf is so wide between the two that it would require a wonderful animal to bridge across. Thirty cubic inches is the largest gorilla brain ever discovered, and seventy cubic inches is the smallest human brain. So it would require a bridge of forty spans to cross that gulf; but they tell us that it required millions of ages to give us the present state of things: but those millions utterly failed to give us the forty spans, and there lies the gulf, unspanned. This is not all. It has been shown, allowing the heat has passed out of our earth uniformly as at present, that inside of a limited period in the past, comparatively speak-

ing, our earth was so intensely hot as to be capable of melting a mass of rock equal to itself in bulk. There are but two ways out of this difficulty, one is to utterly disregard the facts and axioms of science and common sense, and the other is to take Mr. Tyndall's short-cut saying, "All were potentially in the fire cloud," which Mr. Spencer says is unthinkable, and Spencer was right. Who can think of the germs of organic life, either vegetable or animal, being in or produced by a fire cloud.

Neither Dr. Darwin or his followers and admirers can see any design in nature, because they have retired a personal God from His own homestead, set Him to one side. But they can see a far-off man in a few old chip-flints and a few old stone axes. It is a law of mind to associate an adequate cause with every effect, and it is the business of science to catalogue effects, to classify them and note their relations as antecedents and consequents, and from the uniformity of effects determine natural laws.

It is the business of philosophy to pass beyond effects and determine their causes ; to pass from immediate to remote causes, and from them to the ultimate and efficient cause. Philosophy, when it has reached this limit, introduces us to theology, for there is no adequate cause or ultimate cause save God, who is introduced to us in the first verse of the book of Genesis. And here

theology begins. Professor Winchel has well said theology is the granary in which the fruitage of science and philosophy is garnered. So where philosophy ends theology begins.

In our theology the finest future world is ours, and the finest hope is ours ; and in this world the finest life is ours ; and in human thought the finest companionship is ours. And, in fact, the finest death is ours, "for to live is Christ, and to die is gain."



## INTUITION AND INNER MIND.

“Intuition” is defined by Webster in these words : A looking on, a sight or view, or perception, but restricted to mental view, the act by which the mind perceives the truth of things immediately, or the moment they are presented without the intervention of other ideas, without reasoning or deduction. The term is composed of *in* and *tueor*, which is defined, First, to perceive by the mind immediately without the intervention of argument or testimony. Exhibiting truth to the mind on bare inspection, as intuitive evidence. Second, received or obtained by intuition, or simple inspection, as intuitive judgment or knowledge. Third, seeing clearly, as an intuitive view or vision. Fourth, having the power of discovering truth without reasoning.

The adverb intuitively is defined by immediate perception without reasoning, as to perceive truth intuitively. All this would be impossible without the inner intelligence ; without it we could not know anything in any way whatever ; without it we would not be men. This is the necessary basis of free will and responsibility ; it

is the I myself ; but the intuitions of the mind are those simple truths which are recognized by all rational intelligences. All knowledge, when analyzed, finds its basis in first or simple truths. No intuition, no tuition ; because you can't educate where there is nothing to educate, where there is no mind.

This word intuition strikes down the materialistic philosophy of mind and contradicts the physical force theory of thought, that is, of thinking only as the molecules of the brain are set in motion by impressions made upon the sensorial organs. Upon this theory intuition is a misnomer and mind a fiction. The term intuition is just equal to the presence of the inner mind. Intuitive truths don't require proof ; we know them to be true. They are matters of knowledge. They exist in consciousness as so many axioms. They are not the mind, but belong to the mind, and are never to be confounded with the mind. They prove the existence of the mind just as properties prove the existence of their substantives. We know by intuition that an inner mind exists, called, in holy writ, the inner man, and the hidden man of the heart, and also, in the Christian's case, "a meek and quiet spirit," which is the only intelligence. See First Cor., 2:11: "For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him." We know as

certainly that the inner subjective exists, as we do that the outer objective exists.

By intuition, or conscious knowledge, we know the substantive of thought. In the physical-force theory it is claimed that external objects make impressions upon our sensorial organs, and these produce some incomprehensible change in the nerve currents that pass over the nerves to the brain ; these, in their turn, make some incomprehensible change in the brain, set the molecules in motion and they secrete thought. A French atheist said, in the days of Voltaire : “The brain secretes thought as the liver does bile.” Here is the place where all Christians and materialistic atheists and materialistic professors of religion part ; here the road forks. All materialists say the impressions are made upon the brain, and all others say the impressions are made upon the mind or intelligent spirit, for mind and spirit are used interchangeably in the writings of the New Testament. See Romans 1 :9, and 7 :25.

The brain forms the most largely developed portion of the nerves. This being true, why should we say impressions are made upon the sensorial organs and then carried by the nerves to the nerves? Here is tautology for you. And here the physical-force theory of thought breaks down.

Men who study psychology as the second definition of physiology are under no necessity of

stopping with the brain and dissecting knife. It is time that all Christian scientists were getting away from this materialistic break-down. Through the organs of sense impressions are made upon the mind. The mind is the thinker, and the thinker is the man.

Are the molecules of the brain grinding away, secreting thought? Is the inner man, the hidden man of the heart, the mind, a fiction? The organs of sense are the outposts of the mind or spirit, which gives life to the entire system. Impressions are made upon the mind and it is stimulated to action. Sometimes external objects make no impressions upon it, because of its condition—its utter indifference to that which is heard, or seen, and this proves that mind governs in all these matters.

The brain is related to the mind as the organ is to the musician. I once read of two boys who were always, up to a certain time, idiots. You will see an account of them in Winslow's *Physiology* if you wish. One of them fell out of his father's hay mow, lit upon his head on the barn floor, cracked his skull, and was rational ever after. The other got into a racket with a neighbor boy who struck him on the head, cracked his skull and ever after that he was rational. These facts prove that it is the condition of the brain, and not the brain itself, which has to do with the manifestations of the mind. The mind may



be, and often is, very active while the sensorial organs are all locked up in sleep. In this case it has its connection with the objective in thought only, for there is thought in dreams. All the changes in this whole affair of mental exertions are changes in the mind, changes in thought or mental action.

The idea of changes in sensorial organs, nerves and nerve currents, or in the molecules of the brain, when I am perceiving, is all naked assumption without one shadow of evidence to justify such a conclusion. When you endorse those assumptions you are tied up in the coils of the materialistic and atheistic philosophy, where you are without a basis for future existence, and without a basis for axioms to stand upon. When a man reaches the conclusion that life is a physical effect, his cart is before his horse." And then when he stands beside a corpse and realizes that, in case man is all animal, identity is lost, what hope can he have of a future existence? Having adopted these conclusions his common sense drives him into atheism, or to the idea that "death ends all."

Mr. Read says, in his work on the intellectual powers, "But whatever be the nature of those impressions made upon the organs, nerves and brain, we perceive nothing without them ; experience informs us that this is so." This statement is bare assumption which strikes down intuition,

strikes down manhood and conflicts with the fact of an inner mind, which is able to work upon already attained capital and increase its own stock of knowledge, even while in the prisoner's cell, cut off from the objective world. Mr. Read immediately ruins his own statement by adding: "But we can not give a reason why it is so. In the constitution of man, perception, by fixed laws of nature, is connected with mere impressions." Now listen, "but we can discover no necessary connection." In these quotations we have, first, a contradiction; second, a complete surrender of the physical-force theory. That the mind is stimulated to action, or thought, through the sensorial organs is a fact, and that often it is not is a fact. If we say we conceive nothing without them, we are mistaken. We see and hear a thousand things which make no impression upon us.

It is mind that governs? There is conception, and mental perception, and intuition, a trinity by which we gain knowledge independent of external objects, making impressions upon sensorial organs. There is a world of mental perceptions and conceptions, all lying inside, in the subjective. One man perceives that it will be to his advantage, financially, to tell a lie, and he does it. Another man conceives that it will be to his advantage in a political enterprise to misrepresent facts, and he does it. Another man con-

ceives that it is to his personal interest to set up a saloon, and he does it. Another conceives that some man who has opposed his intentions should be shot, and he lays in ambush and shoots him. In fact, about two-thirds of moral and immoral character, as well as political, is the result of mental conceptions and perceptions, which impressions from the objective has nothing to do with.

Is it true when a man's sensorial organs are locked up, and he is thinking in dreams that which never was true and never will be true, that his thoughts are the result of impressions made by external objects upon his sensorial organs? By the way, when a man is thinking in his sleep there is either an internal thinker who can think without those impressions upon his sensorial organs, or otherwise the sensorial organ theory of thought by impressions from external organs is false, because in sleep the gateway is closed. The idea that there is a change, of necessity, in sensorial organs, nerves, and brain in order to thought is a fancy picture of the human imagination opposed to psychological facts. What change takes place in the optic nerve, or in its current, when I turn my eyes from white to blue, or from blue to red? Will any man tell me? It never has been done. Will any man tell me how ideas are differentiated by changes in the nerve currents, or in their fibers?

A man's ideas are differentiated in harmony with mental conditions, politically, morally and religiously. Are they not? Men have been wonderfully exercised by the belief of a lie. If old Jacob had not believed the lie when he saw Joseph's coat stained with blood he might not have given himself so much trouble. Do you say the bloody coat made him believe the lie—made him—do you say? If he had been smart as some Yankees he might have held an investigation and determined whether the blood was human blood. I concede that it was very natural for him to be deceived by the bloody coat, but he came to his conclusion very hastily. One would think that the manifest credulity of secularists, sceptics and atheists would have destroyed that old idea that belief is necessitated. If men were compelled to believe, the Nazarene would never have said, unbelief is sin. Jacob made up his mind very hastily; his mental condition had a vast deal to do with it, because his affections were very strongly set upon Joseph.

As a general rule men's mental conditions have a very great deal to do with their beliefs. If some expert had convinced Jacob that the blood on that coat was not human blood it would have given Jacob great relief. We are also wonderfully exercised by the belief of the truth. Emotions, also, are in harmony with mental conditions. Mind governs. It is the mind that makes the



man. Even Voltaire said: "I do not get my thoughts from external surroundings, for they have none to give." The thinker dwells within. In all our conversations and language we should substitute mind for brain. When you say an impression was made, remember that impressions are made upon mind, and not upon matter. If you mean a physical impression I shall not object, but I shall always advocate that use of words which is strictly in harmony with truth in psychology. Impressions upon physical nature through mental conditions are purely sympathetic.

An old poet said :

"That mind and body sympathize, 'tis plain.  
Such is the union nature ties.  
But then 'as often too they disagree, "  
Which proves the soul's superior progeny.  
Passion riots, reason then contends,  
And on the conquest every bliss depends."

The spirit's personality is evinced by its ability to conceive of things that never did exist, such as the centaur, a thing half horse and half man. Is it only an image? How did it get there without its external object? You say it is only a complex idea, having its images already on the brain? But what is it that has the power to cut images into pieces and combine them in unknown forms? You have no such objects be-

fore the camera. O, it is only imagination, that is all there is of it. So say I, image on the brain is a humbug, it is only a fancy picture created by no objective, but by the imagination. Image is but another name for imagination, which is a mental attribute.

In all languages, in analogical reasoning, men use symbols. On this very account it happens that what one man calls a conception, which is the right name, another man calls an image, and transfers it from mind to brain. The transfer is where all the error lies. We speak of weighing motives and arguments, but why should we literalize the symbol by claiming its picture upon the brain? The atheistic philosophy of thought transfers the symbols of analogical reasoning from the mind to the brain, from their true location, which is imagination. This is an abuse of analogical reasoning, a change of the basis of symbols from the imagination to the brain. There is no need of any intelligent man being misled by analogical symbols employed to designate a conception. There is no more reason to believe that there are literal images upon the brain than there is to believe that literal scales, thrashing machines and railroads are there.

A noted writer has said : "We know of nothing that is in the mind but consciousness, and we are conscious of nothing but various modes of think-

ing, such as understanding, reflecting, willing, passion, doing and suffering.”

I may have conceptions of objects which really exist, but are hundreds of miles away, and I have no reason to think that they ever acted upon me, nor I upon them. Then I can think of the first and last years of the Jewish age, or upon the first and last of any other series. To account for the power of conception by images in the brain subjects us to serious difficulties.

First. When I perceive a horse I know that it is not an image of a horse that I perceive, but the animal itself. Can't I have the reality in mind instead of an image on the brain? Do I not know the difference between a horse and his picture?

Second. It involves the absurd idea that there must be a faculty of the brain which perceives images on the brain.

Third. That seeing such images upon the brain causes conceptions of things far away, and also conceptions of things which never had an existence. If you ask me what is the idea of a square, I do not say, it is an image, but that it is a square, having four right angles, and that its sides are equal; so the idea in mind is a square—a species of thought, not an image on the brain. I have conscious knowledge that it is really a square that I perceive. One writer has said: “We are all blockheads in some things.” This may be true, but why should we, in our great

effort to get away from blockheads, run into pictureheads?

The term man, according to Müeller and Graff, is derived from a term that means to think ; so no think, no man, is a first truth. Intuitions are called primitive beliefs by some scientists, whereas they should be called, as they often are, transcendental truths, supereminent, surpassing all other truths, because self-evident matters of conscious knowledge. Observation does not give them to us, and experience does not modify them. Even savages know them intuitively. They need no proof, no argument, to cause them to be respected, and no amount of reasoning can destroy them. Let us mention a few of them. Involution lies behind evolution. You can't get more out of a thing than there is in it.

No antecedent life, no life.

Life only produces life.

No thinker, no thought.

No thinker, no man.

To get more out of a thing than there is in it is the same as to create something of nothing. Every circumference has a center. You can't find a thing where it is not.

You can't find a man where there is no man.

Where there is no life there can be no dying.

Where there is no law there is no transgression.

No lie is of the truth.

No truth is a lie.



Intuition lies behind tuition.

No intuition, no tuition.

Intuitions are inherent in mental nature. I know that I desire. I know that I know. I know that I love. I know that I hate. I know that I think. I know that I believe. All these verbs have their substantive in the I. In every act of consciousness there is the I and the not I. Consciousness is double. Consciousness of thinking, and consciousness of that about which I am thinking. To doubt the fact of consciousness is to doubt our own existence.

Conclusion : Any theory, science, so-called, or philosophy, or religion, or system, which contradicts first truths, is unreasonable to the same extent, and unworthy of credence.

Our secularists, as well as others, are always calling for facts, and men who do this should recognize facts in a practical way. They should ever be mindful of the contrast between fleshly affections and sensibilities, and mental and spiritual principles and attributes. Governed by their materialistic philosophy and fleshly sensibilities, carried in thought away beyond their natural and legal relations, they are continually measuring the future spiritual being by the fleshly of the present. They profess to anticipate a miserable future existence, provided any part of the human family should, in going to their "own place," miss the place of pure spirits. Then they will be

much more sensitive than now, and have much more sympathy.

There is much suffering in this world, and much poverty. Do they not sleep well, and board well ; get all they can in an honorable way, and keep it for their little constellation or family ? They are sensitive enough to vote to legalize the saloons of their country, which destroy one hundred thousand annually, in both soul and body. Verily it would turn them into hell if they should, in the great hereafter, learn that a small portion of the millions upon millions should miss heaven.

Do they think, "How many feel, this very moment, death with all the sad variety of pain ? How many sink in the devouring flood or more devouring flame ? How many bleed, by shameful variance between man and man ? How many pine in want and dungeon's gloom, shut from common air, and common use of their limbs ? How many drink the cup of baleful grief, or eat the bitter bread of misery, sore pierced by wintry winds ? How many shrink into the sordid hut of cheerless poverty ? How many shake with all the fiercer tortures of the mind, unbounded passion, madness, guilt, remorse ; whence, tumbled headlong from the height of life, they furnish matter for the tragic muse ?" Do they not ? Yes ! And yet there be those who are unmoved by all

there is of woe and misery, who fancy that in case any spirit misses heaven, in the great hereafter, when the law of affinity will take every spirit to its own place, they will be very miserable ; they are so sensitive, so sympathetic. And, if all this be true, they will not be then what they are just now—will they?

## MIND OR SOUL, ITS FACULTIES AND VALUE.

Psychology is from *psuche* and *logos*; *psuche*, soul, and *logos*, discourse. A discourse upon mental science is a discourse upon psychology. Consciousness is the last result of mental analysis, an ultimate principle, a primary datum of intelligence, sometimes called an *a priori* principle, that is, a first cause; sometimes a transcendental condition of thought; all of which simply means, no consciousness, no thought. It lies at the root of all experience, and can not be resolved into any higher principle. It gives us the contrast between mind knowing and matter known. One is the existence of physical nature; the other is the existence of incorporeal or spiritual nature. Consciousness is a simple fact of intelligence; another name for *I myself*. In one word, the fact of consciousness, as a general fact, gives the distinction of the I and not I belonging to consciousness as the general condition of the mind.

There are three rules to be remembered when we undertake to give an analysis of consciousness: First. That no fact be assumed as a fact of consciousness unless it be an ultimate which can



not be simplified, such as I know that I know, I know that I love, I know that I hate, I know that I desire, I know that I hope, I know that I believe.

Second rule. While every mental phenomenon, such as love, may be called a fact of consciousness, we must distinguish consciousness from all such facts. They may or may not exist, and are therefore called modifications of consciousness, being certain conditions of the mind, branches of which consciousness is the trunk.

Third rule. That we must distinguish the special and derivative phenomena of mind from the primary and universal. For example, in the act of perception, which belongs to the particular faculty of perceiving, I distinguish between the thing perceived and the faculty of perception; between the thing remembered and the faculty of memory; between the thing believed and the faculty of believing; between the thing hoped for and the faculty of hoping; between the thing determined and the faculty which determines. The mind is the substantive of all these particular facts, while the faculties themselves are universal. Consciousness is that which takes notice of all particular facts as soon as they transpire, and all these are derivative phenomena of mind, or consciousness, which is the I myself, for perceiving is only the act of a perceiver, and hating is only the act of one who hates, and so on.

Consciousness is a general universal fact, because it is common to all men, and common to all the primary universal faculties, or powers of action. This general fact of consciousness is the one universal nominative to all those particular facts in which men differ so much ; one hoping for one thing and another hoping for another ; one believing one thing and another believing something else ; one loving one thing and another something else. In the derivative facts of consciousness men differ, while the particular universal facts of consciousness are the same always and everywhere. The derivative facts which I have mentioned, with all other derived facts which make up human character, are to be known as modifications of consciousness or mind, conditions of my being. Why? I answer, because I can not believe without knowing that I believe, nor hate without knowing that I hate, nor hope without knowing that I hope, and so on through all the particulars known in human experience. The ability to do each particular thing I call a primary, universal, particular faculty to do this or that.

Consciousness is the soul, spirit or mind in possession of a knowledge of its own modifications, or taking notice of its own mental operations. The first rule in the analysis is that we always remember that all facts of consciousness are ultimate and simple. Here is the meaning

of both terms : I know that I know ; I know that I believe ; I know that I hope ; I know that I love ; I know that I hate ; I know that I desire ; I know that I perceive ; I know that I conceive. These are simple facts and ultimate, because I have expressed, in the terms themselves, all that any man can express of them. Consciousness, as the general universal fact, is the I myself. Who is this I? And what of him?

The word "psychology" contains the answer ; it is the soul as distinguished from the body, and from all mere animal souls. It is the rational, intelligent soul known as the spirit of man ; a soul which a man can not kill, which embodies all the mental faculties, with all their powers and capacities. The science of psychology is the summation, or sum total, of all the facts of mind, which mark the condition of the I. Consciousness is an incomprehensible, simple, universal fact. You can not logically define it. If you could it would cease to be incomprehensible. Neither can *you* simplify it, nor any other simple. All we can do is to rest our case in the term itself. We use it as a synonym of I, of spirit, and of mind, because it is so used in our language, and in the science of psychology. These terms are ultimate, because you can't get behind them, nor make any more out of them than they express. In psychology they all mean the same. In the Bible the term "soul" is generally used in the sense

of person, or animal life, which is distinguished from *the* spirit, which only knows the things of the man to whom it belongs. So we read of souls dying, famishing, perishing, and such like. But even in the Bible, as in all languages the world over, we have the term used as it is in psychology, to designate the living spirit which a man can not kill, but this is the exception in Biblical literature.

It is also worthy of remark that the term "heart" is also used in a double sense. We are very familiar with its physical currency, but it has been transferred to the incorporeal plane of thought, and used in the sense of spirit, or mind, when it is said of our adorning, "Let it be the hidden man of the heart in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which in the sight of God is of great price;" and also, when it is said: "With the heart, man believeth unto righteousness;" and when it is said: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks;" and when David said: "Your heart shall live forever." We need not multiply words upon the fact that heart and mind and soul are used in holy writ to designate one and the same—nor to further establish the idea of the terms "soul" and "heart" being used with a double meaning. This double use of words is based upon the fact of the existence of the corporeal—the perishing, and the incorporeal, the



not perishing. We have the outward man perishing in contrast with the inward man, which "is renewed day by day, renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him in righteousness and true holiness."

In Zechariah 12:2, it is said of the Creator: "It is He that stretcheth forth the heavens and layeth the foundations of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." The heart that David said, shall live forever, and the hidden man of the heart, the meek and quiet spirit, and the soul that the Savior said a man could not kill, all mean the incorporeal *I, myself*. The soul which the master gives us to understand is of more value than the whole world. The spirit of man only knows the things of the man; the spirit without which the body is dead, being alone; the spirit, the master said, was willing while the flesh was weak; the soul which came again into the body of the Shunammite woman's son when he was restored to life; the spirit of life from God, which entered into the dead bodies which John saw when they rose and stood upon their feet.—*Revelations 11:11*.

Psychology and physiology meet in the physical system upon the plane of the nerves. It is a wonderful union involving an equally wonderful contrast. The voluntary nerves do not move as do the involuntary. The ultimate in the analysis of the voluntary nerves is the will; or mind's

action, the willing spirit, which is the basis of my moral manhood, the basis of my free-will and of my responsibilities. The voluntary nerves are the wires over which my willing spirit exerts its powers at the mind's bidding. I will, and immediately move. The voluntary nerves are a kingdom over which mind is king, while over the involuntary, physical laws reign, and the result is perpetual action; the simple presence of the spirit in the body is all that is necessary here. Will does not govern here; if it did, I could die at will. I can move and work at will, but I can't die at will, because the involuntary nerves are not under the control of my will. They connect with my stomach that digests, with the lungs that breathe, with the liver that secretes bile, and with the kidneys that carry impurities from the system; these do all their work whether I will or not. It is remarkable that the involuntary nerves are connected with the cerebellum, while the voluntary are connected with the cerebrum.

The dividing line between the reign of physical laws and a free responsible agency is seen in the contrast between the voluntary and involuntary nerves. This contrast contradicts all the theories of necessity concerning moral, political and religious action. So does the science of psychology, for believing is the act of a believer, and loving is the act of a lover. These are simple and ultimate facts of consciousness. Some men have

denied their religion to save their lives, while others have, in the exercise of their free will, suffered martyrdom in the fields of political, moral and religious action. When a man begins to advocate the doctrine of necessity in morals, politics or religion, call his attention to the voluntary nerves, the kingdom of the will. This alone should be sufficient to silence any intelligent advocate of that old, unscientific, absurd theory of fatalism. The only definition of psychology, given by Webster, is the second definition of physiology, which has to do with both voluntary and involuntary nerves. Both sets are the wires over which all the music of human life is played.

But we must remember that freedom has its limits, because there are natural and moral impossibilities. The moral are always contingent, that is, conditional, which is as much as to say, I can not serve God and Mammon at the same time. I can take my choice and do either, as I choose. I can't be a Christian and a sinner at the same time. The moral can not means no more than this on the moral plane.

No sensible man will call up the power of either God or man in connection with absolute or natural impossibilities. No power in the universe has anything to do with natural impossibilities. The possible is the limit of power, whether it be human or divine. I was once in a discussion with a materialist, near Laketon, in

Wabash county, Indiana, upon the subject of our condition after the death of the body. My opponent defined death by saying: "It is the reverse of the creative act; it places man where Adam was before the Lord made him." For the sake of the argument I admitted his definition, and said to him: "When we, with all the rest of mankind, are where Adam was before the Lord made him, there will not be a man, woman nor child for heaven, earth nor hades. The Lord himself could not find one in three weeks with a candle." I said: "I do not doubt the power of the Infinite One to create a man; but," said I, "when there was not a man to till the ground the Lord did not go about to find one, but created one. And, according to your definition of death, when the Lord creates again they will not be the same, but another set of fellows." He cried over this, and quit the discussion. *It was over.*

An old writer said: "It is the mind that makes the man," and John said, "Try the spirits, for many false teachers are gone out into the world." Man is a spirit served by an organism, which is his medium of connection with the objective world. Death takes down this medium. Organizations only perish. A spiritual body will heal the breach that death has made, and man, as a spirit, will be once more gloriously connected by an imperishable medium with all the glories of the heavenly Father's great house, the



law of affinity taking care of each and every spirit, and each going to his own place, and being what it made itself as a spirit. "Every man in his *own order*."

I regard the brain, with its great ganglea lying at its base, as the seat or throne of the mind or spirit, and the nervo-vital fluid, or living fluid, as the investient of the nerves. The spirit's home is the body, and its medium of connection with the body is nervo-vital fluid, from which we have the beautiful figure, "water of life." Is there nothing incorporeal about the nervo-vital fluid? Is there, as Dr. Dodd says, electricity used by the spirit in carrying on the circulation of the blood, and contracting muscles, and carrying on perpetual action in the involuntary nerves, and motion in the voluntary at will? Is the nervo-vital fluid secreted by the brain? Is it the home of the spirit? Is it the investient of the entire nerve manikin?

Is there nothing incorporeal connected with the bioplasts, those liquid globules located more numerous where the greatest draft is made upon the physical system? And why is it that, in the living subject, they are always in motion? Answer: The spirit of life is in them. This is the only scientific and Christian solution. Here again we rest the case in the simple and ultimate term life, which can not be simplified, because it

is a simple, nor logically defined, because it is an incomprehensible. If I live in thought at this point, in a wilderness of darkness, the advocates of the physical-force theory live a thousand miles further in the same wilderness. Incorporeal or spiritual nature is the only nature possessing inherent living power and motion. These are its two primary efficient, inseparably connected in every spirit.

Inertia is a property of matter. All motion is either relative or absolute. If a desk ever moves, the motion will be related to something that moves it, and no other dead matter will move it, unless something moves this other dead matter against it, and so on until you reach a vital force. No life, no action, is axiomatic ; therefore life was before motion in matter began to be. In our bodies we had, first of all, life, then motion. And it is a remarkable fact that the life was in the spermatozoa. I systematize thus : First, life ; second, motion ; third, will, or the action of the mind, free-will. I am obliged to distinguish between the nervo-vital fluid and the spirit, which wills, and knows, and testifies, by the simple fact that when the great cords, essential to the movement of the lower limbs, are dried up just above the hips, by the application of a fly-blister, or by any other cause, there will be no circulation over those cords, and, consequently, no moving of those limbs, no assimilation. The process of

building or making muscle in those limbs will cease, and they will shrink away and become very small, which proves that the nervo-vital fluid is the means by which the spirit changes dead matter, taken into the stomach, into living organic nature, duplicating the creative act. Above the injury the body will be in its normal healthy condition. I have known two such cases in my time, which were perfect examples of this condition. They were left with at least one consolation, and that was that those cruel fly-blisters could not affect anything except the physical organization. The hidden man of the heart, the meek and quiet spirit, is above the fly-blistering operations of men.

## MIND, SOUL, SPIRIT, INTELLECT AND EMOTIONS.

“Mind, from man, to think ; the intellectual or intelligent power ; the understanding ; the power that conceives, judges or reasons ; a manifestation of intelligence. When the mind, says Locke, turns its view inward upon itself, thinking is the first idea that occurs ; wherein it observes a great variety of modifications, from which it frames to itself distinct ideas. Thus the perception, annexed to any impression on the body, by an external object, is called sensation ; when an idea recurs, without the presence of the object, it is called remembrance ; when sought after by the mind and again brought into view, it is called recollection ; when ideas are taken notice of, and retained in memory, it is attention ; when the mind fixes its view on any one idea, and considers it on all sides, it is called study. The general term mind also means intellectual capacity ; liking ; choice ; inclination ; affection ; will ; desire ; intention ; purpose ; design ; thoughts ; sentiments ; opinion ; memory ; remembrance ; as to call to mind ; to bear in mind ; to fix the mind on ; to attend to ; to fix the thoughts on ; to



notice ; to mark ; to observe ; to heed ; to regard ; to attend to with submission ; to intend ; to mean ; to bear in mind ; to incline ; to be disposed." The term mind is used with all or any of these meanings ; the essential whole being put for any one of its parts, because mind is essential to any one of these definitions.

The term soul is defined, the thinking, spiritual, rational and imperishable principle in man which distinguishes him from the brute creation ; that part of man which enables him to think and reason, and which renders him a subject of moral government ; sometimes the so-called animal soul ; or in other words, the seat of vital function ; the sensitive affections, exclusive of the voluntary and rational powers, in distinction from the higher nature or spirit of man. Occasionally it is put for the seat of emotions and feelings as distinguished from intellect, and sometimes again it is put for the intellect or understanding, pure and simple, in distinction from feeling ; as the imperishability of the soul ; hence, the vital principle, spirit. Again it is put for essence, which is the animating power or part, as brevity is the soul of wit ; hence, the inspirer, leader or ruling spirit of any action, enterprise or undertaking, as an able statesman, is the soul of his party. It is used in the sense of courage, fire, ardor, energy, fervor, or grandeur of mind ; any excellent or sublime

manifestation of the emotional or moral nature as the will to do, the soul to dare.—*Scott*.

“A human being ; a person ; an individual ; as she had three hundred souls on board when she was lost. A pure or disembodied spirit. ‘Every soul in heaven shall bend the knee.’ ”—*Milton*.

“The word soul is frequently used as a familiar designation for person, usually associated with some term used adjectively, as I pity the poor soul, or he was a good soul. It is also used largely in the formation of compounds, as soul-consuming, soul-distracting, soul-hardening, soul-reviving. SOULLESS—Without a soul, or lacking greatness or nobleness of mind ; mean, craven, abject, spiritless, as a soulless villain.”

The term spirit is also used with great latitude. It is thus defined : “Life itself ; an incorporeal, intelligent substance, or being ; vital or active principle ; essence, force or energy, as distinct from matter ; life or living substance, considered apart from material or corporeal existence. The soul of man as distinguished from the body wherein it dwells.” “If we exclude space,” says Watts, “there will remain in the world but matter and mind, or body and spirit.” “The spirit shall return unto God who gave it.”—*Eccle. 12:7*. It is also used in the same manner as mind and soul to designate any and every thing to which it is essential.” “In philosophy the fluid which is supposed to circulate through the

nerves, and which has been regarded as the agent of sensation and motion, and as analogous in its effects and properties to electricity ; the nervous fluid or principle.'—*Dunghlinson*.

Mind, soul and spirit are used in our language and defined in such a manner as to show that they are a trinity in unity, synonymous in their general currency in every-day speech, and as general terms used to designate everything to which they are essential, each term being used for its every part or quality. This all grows out of the axiom, that you can't separate a thing from its properties, or qualities, or attributes. It is a law of language that in defining words we must always keep inside the attributes, or qualities, of the things themselves. I must tell you that there are three questions to be answered in the study of any one thing :

First. What is it?

Second. What are its relations?

Third. What are its uses? When these questions are answered all is told. The figure of speech that carries the essential whole, as the name of each and every part, of any general term or whole, is called the synecdoche. The terms mind, soul, and spirit have many uses, or, in other words, they are parent terms having many children, and the science of psychology is known in its entirety inside of these families. These include the intellect, which is closely allied to

mind, to soul, to spirit, and is also a parent term having many definite uses, and is as incomprehensible as the others. We can certainly know the uses we make of the words, but this is all. We never will be able, at least in this state of being, to comprehend such incomprehensibles, but we can rest our case in the terms and their uses. Intellect is from the Latin, *intellectus*, which is composed of or from *intelligo*—*inter*, and *lego*, to select, to catch with the eye; *lego*, is to read.

“Intellect is that faculty of the soul or mind which perceives, or understands, or which receives, or comprehends the ideas communicated to it by the senses, or by perception, or by other means. It is the faculty of thinking; the understanding; the power of discovering; act or exercise of knowing; discernment; intellectual capacity; skill or knowledge; the pure intellect; faculty of exercising the higher functions of the understanding; a person of intelligence; a spiritual being; usually applied to pure spirits.” “For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of man which is in him.”—*1st Cor. 2:11*.

The term emotion is defined, to move; a moving away; a stirring or rousing up; a moving of the mind; mental excitement; any agitation of the mind or excitement of the sensibilities; feeling; perturbation; tremor. In philosophy, a state of feeling awakened through the medium of the



intellect, and manifesting itself by some sensible effect on the body. An emotion differs from a sensation in not springing directly from an affection of the body.

And according to Lord Karnes an emotion differs from a passion in this, that it passes away without exciting any desire, whereas a passion is accompanied with a desire. Emotions, regarded in themselves, can hardly be called springs of action. They tend rather to quiescence and contemplation, fixing the attention on the objects or occurrences which excited them, but they combine with springs of action, and give them a character and a coloring.

Mr. Bain, in his work upon mind and body, springs several very important questions, among which we find the following, with answers: If all mental facts are at the same time physical facts, some will ask what is the meaning of a proper mental fact? Second. Is there any difference at all between mental agents and physical agents? Answer: There is a very broad difference, which may be easily illustrated. When any one is pleased, stimulated, cheered, by food or bracing air, we call the influence physical, and through these upon the nerves, by a chain of sequence, purely physical. But when one is cheered by good news, by a pleasing spectacle, or by a stroke of success, the influence is mental sensation; thought and consciousness are part of

the chain, although these can not be sustained without their physical basis.

The proper physical fact is a single, one-sided, objective fact. The mental fact is a two-sided fact, one of its sides being a train of feelings, thoughts or other subjective elements. We do not fully represent the mental fact unless we take account of both sides. The so-called mental influences, cheerful news, a fine poem and the rest, can not operate except on a frame physically prepared to respond to the stimulation. While admitting that there is something unique, if not remarkable, in the close incorporation of the two extreme and contrasted facts termed mind and matter, we must grant that the total difference of nature has rendered the union very puzzling to express in language. The history of the question repeatedly exemplifies this difficulty. What I have in view is this: When I speak of mind as allied with body, with a brain and its nerve currents, I can scarcely avoid localizing the mind, giving it a local habitation. I am, therefore, asked to explain what always puzzled the school men, namely, whether the mind is all in every part or only all in the whole; whether in tapping any point I may come at consciousness, or whether the whole mechanism is wanted for the smallest portion of consciousness.

One might perhaps turn the question by the analogy of the telegraph wire, or the electric current, and say that a complete circle of action

is necessary to any mental manifestation, which is probably true, but this does not meet the case. The fact is, that all the time that we are speaking of nerves and wires we are not speaking of mind, properly so-called, at all. We are putting forward physical facts that go along with it, but these physical facts are not the mental fact. Men have studied for centuries to destroy or get rid of this contrast, but the more the question is discussed, the greater the contrast appears. There is no example of two agents so closely united as mind and body without some mental interference or adaptation. Still the union of our incorporeal and corporeal parts is a case quite peculiar, not to say unique; and we are not entitled to pronounce beforehand as to the behavior of two such agents in respect of each other.

There might be certain mental functions of a lower kind partially dependent upon the material organization, while the highest functions might be of a purely spiritual nature, in no way governed by physical conditions. For receiving impressions, in the first instance, we need the external senses; we are dependent on the constitution and working of the eye, the ear, the organ of touch, and so on; yet the deeper processes named, memory, reason and imagination, may be pure spirit, beyond and apart from all material processes. Here Mr. Bain yields the entire question of mind and the physical organism being inseparably connected or united.

MONOTHEISM AND CIVILIZATION—  
NEITHER ORIGINATED IN  
BARBARISM.

The remotest men of whom any account is given, of whom anything is known, were neither fetich, nor polytheists, nor savages. They were believers in a Supreme Being. In fact, all polytheists lived in a retrograde movement from the oldest and truest conception, that of one only Supreme Being, and, after a time had elapsed, they adopted a name for every one of his attributes. During the prevalence of polytheism, the one only Supreme Being was regarded as the father of gods and men, and so their gods were representatives of the Supreme God, whom they worshiped by worshiping his several parts. Voltaire says: "The polished nations of antiquity acknowledged a Supreme God," adding: "There is not a book, not a medal, not a bas-relief, not an inscription, in which Juno, Minerva, Neptune, Mars or any of the other deities is spoken of as a forming being, the sovereign of all nature. On the contrary, the most ancient, profane books that we have, Hesiod and Homer, represent their Zeus as the only thunderer, the only master of gods



and men; he even punishes the other gods; he ties Juno with a chain, and drives Apollo out of heaven."

The Brahmins claim that the Shaster was their first sacred book. Here is a quotation from the first chapter of the Shaster: "God is one. He has created all. It is a perfect sphere without beginning or end. God conducts the whole creation by a general providence, resulting from a determined principle." The second chapter contains a like statement. Max Müller says: "If there is one thing which a comparative study of religions places in the clearest light, it is the inevitable decay to which every religion is exposed. Whenever we can trace a religion to its first beginnings, we find it free from many blemishes that affected it in its later stages." In the history of both civilization and religion we find breaks, downward tendencies, degenerations. The idea of developments without retrogressions is contrary to facts. Our noble conception of a monotheistic religion never originated with an apish idolatry. Paul was right when he said: "When they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts,

and creeping things, \* \* \* they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator.”—*Romans 1*.

Here is the origin of idolatry: A moral retrogression marked the history of these Gentile peoples; they departed from the original monotheism. Paul makes the affirmation, that the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.—*Rom. 1:20*.

This takes us back behind polytheism, and it is corroborated by Hesiod and Homer, and by the first and second chapters of the Shaster, and by the ancient Greeks and Romans.

Jovis—afterward Jupiter—was a translation of Zeus, and Zeus was a translation of the term Jehovah. The magi of Chaldea acknowledged but one Supreme Being, whom they adored in the stars. The Persians adored Him in the sun. The Egyptians called Him *Knef*. The sphere placed on the frontispiece of the temple of Memphis was the emblem of one only and perfect God—their *Knef*. Renouf, in the Hibbert lectures, as quoted by the Duke of Argyle, says: “The polytheism of Egypt is being traced through the many and easy paths which lead to the fashioning of many gods out of the attributes of one.” And adds: “It is incontestably true that the

sublime portions of the Egyptian religion are not the comparatively later result of a process of development or elimination from the grosser. The sublimest portions are demonstrably ancient, and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Roman writers, was by far the grossest and most corrupt.

Rawlinson says: "Latent in the vedas there is found occasionally real monotheism, that here and there breaks forth a real consciousness that all the deities are but different names of one and the same Godhead."

Colebrook says: "The ancient Hindoos recognize but one God. The Rig-Veda speaks of that one which the wise call many names; that he is God above all gods; in the many names was the apparent polytheism, while, in fact, their religion was monotheistic. The Chinese degenerated from their ancient monotheism to the negative indifference of Confucius, and then to the materialism of the present times."

Rawlinson says: "It is thus evident that even in this outlying and remote section of the human race, so little brought into contact with others, there was an early monotheism, which was of a pure and decided character, but which gradually faded away, becoming first the negative and colorless theism of Confucius, and then sinking into oblivion before the attraction of 'spirit worship,' the worship of the creature. Thus we

have a retrogression from monotheism through Confucianism and spirit-worship to materialistic agnosticism and atheism. Monotheism was the primitive religion—the oldest of all.”

That there are periods of progression in the history of peoples no intelligent person will deny, and also periods of retrogression and degradation. The dark ages are a remarkable demonstration of this fact. Mr. Buckle, a distinguished advocate of the evolution theory of religion and civilization, says: “The theologians turn credulity to honor, and have little need to trouble themselves about facts, which indeed they set at open defiance. The inductive philosopher, on the other hand, is obliged to ground *his inference* on facts, which no one disputes, or which, at all events, any one can either verify for himself or see verified by others.”

One who, like Sir Isaac Newton, despises mere hypothesis, mere inference or assumption, and that kind of reasoning called speculative, which always begins with an assumption, must necessarily smile when the advocates of Darwin's hypothesis talk after Mr. Buckle's style, because the entire philosophy of the evolution idea is built upon assumed facts, which, in case they ever occurred, are placed beyond the reach of verification, and beyond the times of the existence of man, outside of human experience, and contrary to all known historic evidence. Millions of years



are the blinds which these men close between us and their assumptions.

Mr. Darwin admits a beginning of species in a creative miracle, giving a few units lying at the base of his series. His common sense reasoning from axioms, or first truths, demanded this, but his admirers, who are determined to leave God out of the question, find no beginning, but try to hide their ignorance with the blind-shutters of millions and millions of years. They have no genesis, or beginning.

We can follow the Romans back to 750 B. C., and before them we have the Greeks. We can follow them back to Lycurgus, 900 B. C. Back of the Greeks we place the Trojan war, about 1200 B. C., and the earlier Hebrew Chronicles were about 1500 B. C. And modern research has laid bare the Egyptian and Mesopotamian annals, so that we now know more, perhaps, of the daily life of the old Memphian and Theban monarchies than we do of the Romans before the Punic wars. Champollion and Young, followed by Layard, Rawlinson, Oppert, Lepsius, Marietta and others, have found the key to the mysterious characters that were stamped upon the Babylonian bricks, or traced on the walls of the Egyptian tombs. The long-sealed records of ancient India, of Phœnecia, of Palestine, of Persia and Moab, have been more or less illus-

trated by archeological inquiry. So we find ourselves face to face with the builders of the pyramids and the Tower of Babel, with the hoary antiquity of the vedas and the first rovers of the sea, whose traces have been found in America.

We find all these primeval peoples, the Chinese, the Hindoos, the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Arabians, the Assyrians, the Phœnicians, the Grecians and the Romans, suddenly appearing on the scene of human existence with a full-fledged civilization, followed by the dark ages in the Roman degeneracy. The builders of the oldest pyramids were acquainted with all the arts of civilized life, and their civilization was in every respect as high as that of any later period of the Egyptian monarchy, and the art was even higher.

Renan says: "When we think of this civilization, it had no infancy, and of this art, of which there remains innumerable monuments, it had no archaic epoch." The Egypt of the oldest times was superior in a sense to all that followed. The same is true of Babylon and Nineveh.

All this guess-work, touching our civilization being an evolution from utter barbarism, is without any evidence whatever. It is naked assumption, unworthy of any intelligent scientist or historian. What do evolutionists, or anybody else, know of the daily life of beings half brute and half human? Evolutionists themselves place

them behind all historic evidence, and outside of the limits of human observation and experience. How can man find the beginning of an assumed evolution, of which neither they nor others ever received any information?

These men, like Ingersoll, are continually calling for facts. One fact, they say, is a legal tender. Very well, we are satisfied with the demand, and shall demand that they cease guessing at things, and get at least inside of human experience, and give us some evidence besides their base assertions. Historical criticism and archeological research take us back to the fourth dynasty of Manetho, and to the third of Berosus, and the east is in a blaze of light—the light of civilized life. These are the facts, and neither science nor history has any account of what preceded this state of things, the Hebrew scriptures excepted—by the way, they give us this same account of the beginning of human history. Two thousand years before Christ, Abraham found in Egypt government, art and architecture, cities and agriculture. Five hundred years before Christ Herodotus found temples, tombs and monuments. So far as any man can discover Egyptian civilization had no infancy. Rawlinson asked this important question: “What does the earliest history say as to the earliest condition of mankind? Does it accord with the bulk of those who write the accounts, now so common, of prehistoric man?

Does it make the primeval man a savage, or something very remote from a savage?" To us it seems that, so far as the voice of history speaks at all, it is in favor of a primitive race of men, not indeed equipped with all the arts and appliances of our modern civilization, but substantially civilized, possessing language, thought, intelligence; conscious of a Divine Being; quick to form the conception of tools and to frame them as it needed them; early developing many of the useful arts, and only sinking by degrees, and under peculiar circumstances, into the savage condition. Here is retrogression again.

Hæckle's notion is that the lost link, the ape man that begat man, was the inhabitant of a now sunken continent south of Asia. And Darwin places him in Africa. And Wagner places him in Europe. And Spiller places him in the polar regions. Hæckle's notion has the advantage of all the others, because it closes forever the search after his bones, and stops all inquiry as to the precise spot where they repose, so we may never weep over his grave. Hæckle's notion ends all questions about the missing link, as well as all questions about the entire chain lying behind the ape man. Darwin says it is probable that Africa was formerly inhabited by extinct apes. This is all, of course, very scientific, coming from men who think so much of facts?

Mr. Tyndall, who believes in justification, not



by faith only, but by verification, says: "Science without verification, instead of being a fortress of adamant, is a house of clay." He also says: "A theoretic conception without verification is a mere figment of the mind." The theory, or hypothesis, that religion, and civilization, and all else, is an evolution from apish superstition and brutal barbarism, is a bundle of ifs. If something is true, something else is true, *and* if, *and* if. It is based upon an infinite number of guesses reaching back across millions and millions of ages. The bulk of its assumed facts are behind historic times, unverified and unverifiable, and opposed to all available evidence.

To accept the hypothesis of evolution you must shut your eyes to all laws of evidence and to all axioms, and if you can't do this you must be content to be relegated, by the wise ones, who claim kinship with brutes, to the uneducated blockheads and fools of our country, by the picture-heads, the wise ones "whose brains are full of pictures" illustrating the evolutionary series of species from first to last—the unknown ape.

There was a time when our ancestors all lived under the same roof, and learned the same lessons, and used the same symbols. The first lesson that I will mention is wrapped up in the symbol known as the Key of the Nile, called the "crux Ansanta" or the hidden wisdom. We

find it with the Egyptians upon the breast of their mummies; with the Chaldeans; with the Phœnicians; with the Peruvians; with the Mexicans; with the Babylonians. It is on their cylinders; it is found in the ruined cities of Central America; it is in the hands of Brahma, Vishna and Siva; it is on the battle-ax of Thor; it is on the pagodas of China; it is with a sect in Japan; it is with the Knights of St. John in Malta, and on the sceptre of the Bompas deities of Thibet; it is on the sculptured stones of Scotland; it is on the ancient coins of Gaul; on the urns of northern Italy. It is found in Persia, in Kamchatka and in Britain. It was emblematic of creative energy, of immortality, of the resurrection, and of the divine unity—the original monotheism—*one God*, and one only.

How was it that all these peoples got hold of the “*Crux Ansanta?*” And how is it that all nations have a legend of the flood? The Greek and Fiji Islander, Ovid and Berosus, carry us to the flood as the beginning of human history. To this agree the Phrygians, the Cherokees, the Peruvians, the Hindoos and the Chinese. Did these people all dream the same thing at the same time? Or was it more than a dream? We have the Chaldean account of the flood, which Mr. George Smith recently deciphered from the Assyrian monuments. He says: “The cuniform inscription which I have recently found and trans-

lated gives a long and full account of the deluge. It contains the version or tradition of this event, which existed in the Chaldean period of the city of Erech, one of the cities of Nimrod, now represented by the ruins of Warka. In this newly-discovered inscription the account of the deluge is put as a narrative into the mouth of Noah. He relates the wickedness of the antediluvians, the command to build the ark, its building, the filling of it, the deluge, the resting of the ark, the sending out of the birds, and other matters. The narrative has a close resemblance to the account transmitted by the Greeks from Berosus, the Chaldean historian."

Appolodorus and Lucian ascribe the deluge to the wickedness of the world. The Phrygian tradition was commemorated by a medal struck at Apamæa in the reign of Septimius Severus. This city was formerly called "Ribotos," or the Ark. On the medal is depicted the ark floating upon the waters. Two persons are seen as if coming out of it. There is a bird upon the top of the ark, and another flying towards it with an olive branch in its feet. On some specimens of this medal we have the letters No, or Nœ.

Humboldt says: "The Aztecs, the Zapotecs, the Flascoltecs and the Mexicans have paintings of the deluge. Secularists say these memories are confined to the Semitic and Aryan races. This is

contradicted by the legends of the Chinese, by the natives of Polynesia, by the American Indians, and by the Tartars. How will secularists dispose of these facts?

Where were all these different peoples, now scattered far and wide, when they all received the lesson of the flood? These world-wide lessons are monuments of the ancient unity of the race, and the civilization of the different peoples, and the monotheism of the Bible.

There is a tradition among nearly all nations of a terrestrial paradise. The Arabians tell of a garden in the east, on the summit of a mountain of Jacinth, covered with trees and flowers of rare colors and fragrance. The *Zendavesta* consists of five books of the Parsees, the descendants of the ancient Persians. The authorship is ascribed to Zoroaster, who, according to Pliny, lived 2,500 years before Christ. These books mention a region which they call *Heden*, a pleasure garden in Persia. The *Vishna Purana* tells us that in the center of *Jambudwipa* is the golden mountain *Meru*, which stands like the seed-cup of the *lotos* of the earth. On its summit is the vast city of Brahma, encircled by the Ganges, which, issuing from the foot of Vishna, is divided into *four streams* that flow to the four quarters of the earth.

The Chinese have their enchanted gardens and their fountain of immortality dividing off into four streams.



We read of the sacred Asgard of the Scandinavians springing from the center of a fruitful land, which was watered by four primeval rivers ; also of the Sineru of the Buddhist, with its four-limbed Deamba tree, with its never-fading blossoms, from between whose roots issue the four sacred streams that water the garden of the Supreme God—Sekrá.

These legends are all taken from Genesis, 2 : 10-15. The earmarks are perfectly visible. Where were all these different people when they learned for the first time these lessons common to them all? They were all at one time under the roof of the ark.

Finally, can any man believe that the son of a carpenter with twelve illiterate men, mechanics, tax-gatherers, fishermen, unassisted by any superhuman wisdom and power, were able to invent and promulgate a system of religion and morals, the most sublime and perfect, which all such men as Plato, Aristotle and Cicero had overlooked, and that they, by their own wisdom, repudiated every false virtue, and admitted every true virtue? Can any man believe that they were impostors for no other purpose than the promulgation of true morality? Villains for no purpose, but to teach honesty? And martyrs with no prospect of honor or advantage? Or that as false witnesses they were able to spread this religion over the known world, in opposition

to all the wickedness which it condemns, in opposition to the ambition and character of mankind in general? Can you believe that those men triumphed, as they did, over the prejudices of the rulers, the intrigues of states, the forces of custom, the blindness of zeal, the influence of priests, the arguments of orators and the philosophies of the world, without any superhuman assistance?

Many impostors and enthusiasts have tried to impose upon the world, but none of them ever volunteered death as a necessary and essential part of their work, and not one in earth's history was ever so sublimely mad as to give such a lesson to poor humanity as the sermon upon the mount; such madness deserves the admiration of the world. Christianity gives to life piety, honesty, and virtue, and in death it gives victory. Absent from the body and present with the Lord. For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.

“Rich hope of boundless bliss!

Bliss past man's power to paint it. Time's to close!

This hope is earth's most estimable prize;

This is man's portion while no more than man;

Hope, of all passions, most befriends us here;

Passions of prouder name befriend us less.

Joy has her tears, and transport has her death;

Hope, like a cordial, innocent though strong,

Man's heart at once inspirits and serenest,

Nor makes him pay his wisdom for his joys;

'Tis all our present state can safely bear,

Health to the frame, and vigor to the mind!  
A joy attempered! a chastised delight!  
Like the fair summer evening, mild and sweet!  
'Tis man's full cup, his paradise below!  
A bless'd hereafter, then, or hoped or gained,  
Is all,—our hope of happiness!"

The fame of all ages, and the wealth of all the world, is not equivalent to the mere hope of living forever in mutual association with the pure, the heavenly.

## INSPIRATION

There is an inspiration that was given to mankind in the creative act. The Lord Himself, interrogating Job (See *Ch. 38 and verse 36*), asks: "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts, or who hath given understanding to the heart?" When Job's comforters had all said their pieces, Elihu came forward, taking the Lord's part, and said: "But there is a spirit in man, and the *inspiration* of the Almighty giveth them understanding."—*Job, 32:8*. This inspiration elevates men above the nature of beasts and all other creatures of the lower kingdom. There are two cases in which this fact is established: 1. The decree uttered with reference to Nebuchadnezzar. "Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him, and let seven times pass over him."—*Dan., 4:16*.

2. *Job, 39th Ch.* The Lord talking to Job, and interrogating him, said: "Gavest thou wings and feathers unto the ostrich? Which leaveth her eggs in the earth, and warmeth them in dust, and forgetteth that the foot may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. She is hardened against her young ones, as though they



were not hers : her labor is in vain without fear ; because God hath deprived her of wisdom [she foresees no evil to her eggs in the dust], neither hath he imparted to her understanding.”

This is the representative of the lower kingdom ; Nebuchadnezzar was let down to this kingdom until seven times passed over him, by having his heart changed from man’s to a beast’s heart. How was this accomplished? Not by taking his spirit from him, for in that case he would have been dead. It was accomplished by taking two things from him which returned to him afterwards. What were they? Answer, his reason and his understanding, the very things which the ostrich did not possess, and which were given to the spirit of man by the inspiration of the Almighty. See *Dan. 4:16, 34 and 36*.

Wherever there is understanding, wisdom to foresee evils that may arise, and reason, there has been *inspiration*. The inspiration of the Almighty gave men all these, and by so doing capacitated them for education by means of external revelation. But, man being connected with this world alone, by his five senses alone, could never rise above himself and his world to another world, without a revelation from the other world. When we came into the world we had a very limited instructive knowledge—enough however to enable us to make an effort for food to supply our hunger. Soon our dependence upon

external revelation began to show itself. Having the capacity to receive sounds and imitate them, we began to talk. And then we were introduced to A, B, C, D. The relation of these letters to each other is not natural but arbitrary, so we had need of faith in our teachers, and here is the beginning of faith.

And here is the source or foundation of my ability and your ability to read and write and speak. There is no other source or foundation. Human capacities, growing out of the original inspiration of the creative act, were and are inherent in human nature, are a part and a very great part of ourselves. These innate capacities were not and are not a sunlight of knowledge, but constitute our natural abilities, which we may neglect or misuse and live and die in ignorance and wretchedness, or, on the other hand, we may use them so as to increase knowledge. The man of two talents may gain two more; the man with five may gain five more; the man with one may be condemned as a wicked man because he buried his talent, making no return to God for elevating him one degree above brute nature; he might have ascended one more degree at least, increasing his talent from one to two.

The original inspiration gave men understanding with ability to foresee evils common in human life, and capacities, abilities to profit by education. And this condition is as universal as the

race. But all this belongs to the lower story, to this world, and never was sufficient for man's greatest happiness, with his longings for another and a better country. The Fijis were, for a long time, at least, with others of our race, cannibals, living on the flesh of women and children. Yet they were qualified by the original, universal inspiration for a better lower-story life. Man, left to the universal original inspiration alone, is left to himself, and the world left to this is left to itself. Men left to this may educate themselves in a very great measure, and have much understanding, and much worldly wisdom, and write many books, but all belong to the lower story. Because they never did, nor ever will get into the upper story without learning from the upper room.

The most noted teacher, Christ, said: "No man can come to Me except the Father which sent Me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets they shall all be taught of God. Every one, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto Me."—*John, 6:44*. The original universal inspiration that some men call the inner light never took a man to Christ and never will, for it is the light of the lower story. Men must hear and learn of the Father, by what means? Through whom? Answer, it must come from the upper story: So the heavenly Father

sent one from the upper story, from heaven to earth, His only begotten Son, and said to the children of men: Hear ye Him. Before he thus spake he chose his own men and gave them His holy spirit, inspiring them, raising them above the plane of the natural to the spiritual, and they all, in advance of the advent of Christ into this world, gave witness to Him, "that through His name whosoever believeth in Him should receive remission of sins."—*Acts, 10:43*.

Jesus said to Thomas, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me. God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son."—*Heb., 1:1-2*. As in the first or lower house, we were blessed with capacities for education, and dependent upon teaching for our knowledge of earthly things, so with our capacities, we are qualified for education from our teacher who came to make us acquainted with heavenly things. How does it come to pass that men who were dependent upon their faith in their first teachers, who lifted them up in the knowledge of earthly things, now repudiate the external revelation of heavenly things, and throw themselves back upon themselves, and in their unbelief or want of faith in the greatest of all teachers make war upon the revelation of heavenly things?



The facts known in the history of pagans ought to cause them to blush with shame. Even old Rousseau, in his unbelief and wickedness, was the author of that saying, Socrates died like a philosopher, but the Nazarene died like a God. With his inner light, which he had by the original inspiration, he said, I have only to consult myself concerning what I do. All that I feel to be right is right. The man that had one talent and buried it was just this kind of a man. Man, left to the inspiration of the creative act, with his talent or talents—one, two or five—is man left to himself; and this is selfishness—the parent of ninety-nine sins of an hundred.

The world, without God's revelation, given by the men of his own choosing, and confirmed by superhuman evidences, is the world left to itself—the world without God, and without hope of another and better world.

If we had not been created with understanding and a good degree of wisdom, as well as with reason, we could not have been educated, except as beasts are educated. And is it not after all external revelation, in the shape of education, that causes the difference between the cannibal, with his face smeared with blood, feeding upon the flesh of women and children, and the civilized American? The cannibals, all, had the inspiration of the creative act—the inspiration that

enables all authors of worldly books to make books—the “world wide inspiration”—the “inner-light.” But which one of all of them ever made a book like the Bible? And which one *of all* ever gave the light of a future life? If the original inspiration, that unbelievers claim belongs to other books, is all that we need, then it is all that the race needs. So Parker must have been right when he said, in his discourses against the Bible, p. 33: “Everything that is of use to man lies in the plain of his own consciousness.”

The Bible revelation, given by the inspiration that is connected with the second creation—the creation of a spiritual family in Christ Jesus, has Christianized and civilized thousands of people who were once cannibals. “Where there is no vision (revelation) the people perish.”—*Prob.*, 29:18. “There is a spirit in every man, which knows the things of the man.”—*2 Cor.*, 2:11. But there is another world besides this, and another spirit besides the spirit of man, and another inspiration besides that inspiration which has filled the world with worldly wisdom and literature. And that is the inspiration of prophets and apostles—men of God’s own choosing, and from this inspiration comes the wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy

and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy.

The advocates of world-wide inspiration, which was given to Adam, the first; secularists denying the Bible and warring against the inspiration connected with Adam, the second, affirm the all sufficiency of one-worldism for the needs of all mankind without association with any form of theology.

The logical outcome of all this is first Atheism, or that there is no God, or, second, that God has left his creatures without any instructions in reference to another world, and another life, yes, without any instructions, even with reference to this life. Some of them say, there is no God, and that death ends all. Some of them are, according to their own statements, poor, miserable, dissatisfied creatures, with no prospect of deliverance. Men who claim no other inspiration besides the universal inspiration have just three ideas touching the future of man. And those are found in pagan history. 1. That death ends all. 2. That the spirit of man will wander about forever in the land of shadows, and fly about and rap tables, and perform some other tricks in answer to the sign or request of some brazen-faced medium. 3. The spirit will pass through a succession of bodies, and keep on passing. This superstition was once very common among

the Hindoos. It is popularly called, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls.

“Tell me,” said a dying Hindoo, “Tell me what will become of my soul when I die?” A Brahman, standing by, said: “Your soul will go into the body of a holy cow.” “And what after that?” “It will pass into the body of a divine bird (peacock).” “And what after that?” “It will pass into a flower.” “Oh! tell me,” said the dying man, “Where will it go last of all—*last of all?*” Unbelievers in the Christian’s religion will never answer this question. They never have. Let us listen to Robert Ingersoll, standing over his brother’s dead body. He said: “Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive *in vain* to look beyond the heights. *We cry aloud*, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. Whether in mid sea or ’mong the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck must mark at last the end of each; and all and every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love, and every moment jeweled with a joy, will, at its close, become a tragedy as sad, and deep, and dark, as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death.”

Then Tyndall said: “Whence come we and whither go we?” Then says: “The question dies without an answer, without even an echo upon the infinite shores of the unknown.” “Where there is no vision [revelation] the people perish.”



The universal inspiration by the creative act never threw any light upon those questions ; its light belongs to the lower house, belongs to this world. Those men fall back upon the inspiration that is natural, and common, and universal, and try to pull the Bible down upon the same plane by denying its *avowed* and special inspiration. Some of them have outrun the Hindoos in the multiplication of their divinities, claiming that every stick, and stone, and reptile, is God. One of those exceedingly wise fellows said to me : “I am God.” And when asked, what is matter, his answer was : “There is no matter.” A doctor standing by said, “there is no matter in you,” and turning upon his heels, left the room.

When men reject the Bible and the religion of Jesus Christ, they are doomed to darkness and the shadow of death. World-wide inspiration is claimed by all unbelievers in the religion of Jesus Christ. And it is claimed to be all that we have need of. It amounts to just this, *do as you please*. Oh ! selfishness ! thou art the parent of more sins than a few. No self-denial can come in here. Those men go further still ; they tell us the will of the majority is only the law of might, and if they can overcome it their will is just as good. With them oaths in civil suits are an idle superstition. There is no further judgment, no endless punishment. Sins are like the morning dew. Some of them say, there is no sin ; others say,

sin is good in disguise. It has been well said that God's rights are the only basis of human rights. Take away God's laws and you have not a vestige of authority left in their world-wide inspiration to any government.

All we have left is the point of the bayonet and the weapons of war. I believe it was Sherman who said war is hell. The rights of God are the only basis of the rights of man. It is the right of the creator to govern his creatures. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," said the framers of the basis of the American government, "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights." So we believe. The facts in the history of our race demonstrate the utter absurdity of the idea that man with his natural inspiration has no need of a revelation from the upper world. The very idea is the folly of universal selfishness, pagan idolatry, and crimes. Plato, a pagan philosopher, had all that is in universal and common inspiration. So had Demosthenes, Cicero, Seneca, and Socrates. Plato said: "He may lie who knows how to do it." He taught, a community of property, and of wives, and said suicide was a mark of heroism. Oaths—profane oaths, are frequent in the writings of both Plato and Seneca. Demosthenes committed suicide, poisoning himself. And these all had superior natural talents, the very highest degree of natural inspiration. And who has

never shed a tear over the fate of Socrates and his last words? He said: "I am going out of this world, and you are to remain in it, but which of us has the better part the Lord only knows."

Hesiod tells us the Romans had thirty thousand gods, and they regarded Jupiter, their master god, as the meanest one of all. In their estimation he must be this in order to excel. They attributed all their attributes of character to their gods. Jupiter was considered an adulterer, Mars a murderer, Mercury a thief, Bacchus a drunkard and Venus a harlot. Their most sacred mysteries were so detestable and infamous that, finally, it was considered necessary for the sake of any remnant of good order to prohibit them. The Roman laws allowed parents to murder infants. The laws of Sparta required the death of unhealthy children. When Agathoclas besieged Carthage two hundred infants were murdered by order of the senate, and three hundred citizens sacrificed themselves, voluntarily, to Saturn. Here the Bible was not in the way, and if a common and natural and world-wide inspiration—world-wide inner-light, ever was sufficient for man's needs, it ought to have saved those lives at Carthage. "Where there is no vision the people perish." Think of the thousands who threw themselves beneath the wheels of the car of old Juggernaut in India and were instantly crushed; think of all the idolatry and paganism of the uncivilized world, through

all the ages of the past, of all the blood that has been shed, and ask yourselves whether the universal, common inspiration gives mankind all we need. - No, it did not save France from the French revolution, nor America from the blood of her civil war.

The Bible is God's book ; it was given by the men whom the Heavenly Father chose and qualified for the work. No prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation. Why? Answer. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the holy spirit.—*2 Peter 1:21*. The Bible is God's book ; God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.—*Heb. 1:1*. And this is the inspiration connected with Adam the second, and with the new creation. In this revelation of God we are invited to the very highest type of true manhood—invited to Christ, invited to life, invited to the city of the great King for our eternal home. Assured that if we heed the invitation we will be gainers even in death, that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord. The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death. “The spirit and the bride say come. And let him that heareth say come. And whosoever will ———”







Jan - 30 1901

JAN 24 1901





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 331 852 5